of section 7 of the Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act, 2003 a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Statement on Quarterly Review of the trends in receipts and expenditure in relation to the budget at the end of the first quarter of the financial year 2005-2006.

[Placed in Library *See* No. LT.-2395/05]

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2005

ग्रामीण विकास मंत्री (श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह): महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूं:-

"कि देश के ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में गृहस्थियों की आजीविका की सुरक्षा को, प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष में, प्रत्येक गृहस्थी को जिसके अवयएक सदस्य अकुशल शारीरिक कार्य करने के लिए स्वेच्छा से आगे आते हैं, कम से कम सौ दिनों का गारंटीकृत मजदूरी नियोजन उपलब्ध करा कर, वर्धित करने तथा उससे संसक्त या उसके आनुषंगिक विषयों का उपबंध करने वाले विधेयक पर, लोक सभा द्वारा पारित रूप में, विचार किया जाए।"

उपसभापति जी, सबसे पहले मैं आपके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करता हूँ और मैं अपने UPA के तमाम साथियों की तरफ से आम जनता की तरफ से आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने इस ऐतिहासिक विधेयक, राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी विधेयक को यहां विचार और पारित करने के लिए अपनी सहमति दी है। इसके लिए हम आपके प्रति आभार व्यक्त करते हैं।

उपसभापति जी, आज का दिन ऐतिहासिक है, इसलिए कि आज सदन में इस विधेयक को पारित करने का दिन आ गया हूँ। मैं देख रहा हूं कि पिछली 18 तारीख को लोकसभा में यह विधेयक इसी तरह से विचार और पारित करने के लिए प्रस्तुत हुआ था, फिर 19 तारीख को रक्षा-बंधन था, 20 तारीख को स्वर्गीय राजीव गांधी जी की जयन्ती को देश भर के लोगों ने सद्भावना दिवस के रूप में मनाया और आज 24 तारीख को इस ऐतिहासिक विधेयक, राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी विधेयक को पारित करने का दिन है। इस देश के लिए यह सप्ताह बड़ा ऐतिहासिक है, तमाम जनता के लिए और खास करके गरीबों के लिए भी यह ऐतिहासिक है।

उपसभापति जी, यह जो विधेयक है, इसका एक इतिहास है। UPA के तमाम नेताओं ने नेशनल कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम बनाया। एक से एक अर्थशास्त्री, समाजशास्त्री, ज्ञानी भी लोगों ने जुट करके नेशनल कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम बनाने का काम किया ताकि करोड़ से अधिक आबादी की, जनता की आकांक्षाओं की पूर्ति हो सके हम लो कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम है, UNA के लोगों ने भी इसकी प्रशंसा की है।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद (बिहार): रघुवंश बाबू के भाषण के बिना यह बिल कैसे चर्चा में आएगा।

श्री उपसभापति: भाषण तो हो गया।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: ...(व्यवधान)... मैंने सब लोगों का धन्यवाद दे दिया है।

श्री उपसभापति: उन्होंने धन्यवाद दे दिया है।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: हमने पहले आसन को धन्यवाद दिया कि हमें इजाजत दी गई। इसी पृष्ठभूमि में कि किस बात के लिए विधेयक लाया गया है, यहां बता दिया।

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया (झारखण्ड): आज आपका जन्म दिन है।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: आज इस ऐतिहासिक विधेयक के पारित होने का दिन है। मैंने प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया है कि देश के ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में गृहस्थियों की आजीविका की सुरक्षा को, प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष में, प्रत्येक गृहस्थी को, जिसके व्यस्क सदस्य अकुशल शारीरिक कार्य करने के लिए स्वेच्छा से आगे आते है,

(श्री सभापति पीठासीन हुए)

कम-से-कम 100 दिनों का गारंटीकृत मजदूरी नियोजन उपलब्ध करा कर वर्धित करने तथा उससे संसक्त या उसके आनुषंगिक विषयों का उपबन्ध करने वाली राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण नियोजन गारंटी विधेयक विचारोपरान्त पारित किया जाए।

श्री सभापति : आप बोलिए । आपका भाषण सुनने के लिए ही मैं आया हूं।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: सभापति महोदय, मैंने प्रस्ताव किया है। यह क्यों पारित किया जाए, मै वह बताना चाहता हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सभापति : मैं तो इनका भाषण सुनने के लिए ही आया हूं।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: सभापति महोदय, हम बड़े भाग्यशाली हैं कि इस तरह के तिहासिक विधेयक को विचारोपरान्त पारित कराने के लिए इस ऐतिहासिक दिन आपने इजाजत ी की कृपा की है। महोदय, इसका इतिहास है कि हिन्दुस्तान पर गरीबी और बेरोजगारी, दो तरह कलंक लगा हुआ है। इसका वर्णन कैसे किया जाए, महोदय, कविवर गोपाल सिंह नेपाली ने ा है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सभापति : यह कलंक कब से लगा हुआ है?

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: कविवर गोपाल सिंह नेपाली ने कहा कि:

दिन गए, वर्ष गए, यातना गई नहीं

रोटियां गरीब की प्रार्थना बनी रही

श्याम की बंसी बजी, राम का धनुष चढ़ा

बुद्ध का भी ज्ञान बढ़ा, निर्धनता गई नहीं।

महोदय, देश के करोड़ों लोग, जो रोजगार के बिना और गरीबी से मुकाबला कर रहे है—हमारे ऊपर वही दो कलंक हैं, गरीबी और बेरोजगारी। इसलिए नेशनल कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम के आधार पर हम लोगों ने सपना देखा है कि 2020 तक बेकारी और गरीबी को समाप्त किया जाए, जिससे हिन्दुस्तान 2020 तक दुनिया के मुल्कों में अगली पंक्ति में खड़ा हो सके। यह हम लोगों का सपना, विज़न 2020 है, उसमें हमारा लक्ष्य यही है। इस नेशनल कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम में हम लोगों ने जनता के सामने, देश के सामने सबसे प्रथम वचन दिया था कि हम एम्प्लायमेंट गारंटी कानून बनाएंगे, जिसमें हम गरीब परिवारों को कम-से-कम 100 दिनों के रोजगार की गारंटी देंगे। लोगों के दबाव और सुझाव और लोगों के उत्साह को देखते हुए, कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम में, जो केवल गरीब परिवारों के लिए था, महोदय, अब उसमें हम लोगों ने और सुधार किया है, उसे व्यापक बनाया है, सभी परिवारों के लिए, जिस किसी भी परिवार के लोग इसमें काम करना चाहें, सारे परिवार को एक साल में कम-से-कम 100 दिनों के रोजगार की गारंटी दी जाएगी। महोदय, जब रजिस्ट्रेशन होगा और किसी भी गांव में यदि 15 दिनों के अन्दर रोजगार नहीं दी जा सकेगी, तो उन्हें बेकारी भत्ता दिया जाएगा। एक महीने तक जो न्यूनतम मजदूरी होगी, उसका एक चौथाई, बाद में उसका आधा करके एक साल तक यदि उन्हें रोजगार नहीं मिलेगा, तो 100 दिनों की जितनी न्यूनतम मजदूरी होगी, उन्हें उतनी मजदूरी बेकारी भत्ते के रूप में मिलेगी। इसलिए यह जो बड़ा भारी नया अमली जामा कानूनी अधिकार के रूप में जनता को 'राइट टू वर्क' के रूप में, 'काम के अधिकार' के रूप में इस विधेयक से मिला है, उसे तैयार करने में, उसे बनाने में, उसे आगे ले चलने में प्रधान मंत्री जी और यूपीए की नेता, श्रीमती सोनिया गांधी जी, दोनों को, हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगो की ओर से मैं धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं, आभार प्रकट करना चाहता हूं।

महोदय, इस विधेयक को लाने में, प्रोत्साहन देने में, बनाने में उन्होंने बड़ा सहयोग दिया है। इसे मंजूर करने से लेकर यहां तक पहुंचाने में उन लोगों का सहयोग और आशीर्वाद मिला है।

श्री विक्रम वर्मा : आप ने सब का नाम लिया, लेकिन लालू जी का नाम नहीं लिया। वह तो नाराज हो जाएंगे।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: आप लोग प्रसन्न रहिए क्योंकि यह गरीबों का विधेयक है।... **(व्यवधान)...**

श्री तारिक अनवर (महाराष्ट्र) : लालू जी से प्रेम तो अच्छी बात है।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: महोदय, यूपीएए के तमाम नेताओं - श्री लालू प्रसाद जी, श्री शरद पवार जी, डा॰ करुणानिधि जो का मैं आभार मानता हूं। फिर हमारे और जितने सहयोगी दलों के नेता जो उधर बैठे हुए हैं, मैं उन का भी आभार मानूंगा। मुझे आशा है कि गरीबों के इस विधेयक में मुझे उन का भी सहयोग मिलेगा। महोदय, वामपंथी दल के नेता - पोलित ब्यूरो के नेता सहित यहां बैठे श्री नीलनोत्पल बसु, श्री मनोज भट्टाचार्य जी, श्रीमती बृंदा कारत, श्री देवव्रत बिस्वास, श्री अवनि राय व श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी सहित सभी माननीय नेताओं का आभार मानता हूं जिन्होंने इस विधेयक में जो कमियां थीं, त्रुटियां थीं उन में सुधार करने और इसे यहां तक लाने में सहयोग दिया। इस बिल को बड़ी मुस्तैदी से यहां तक पहुंचाने में, लाने में और इस का समर्थन कर, परिष्कृत करने, परिमार्जित करने में, गरीबोन्मुखी, समतामुखी और ग्रामीणमुखी बनाने में, इन सभी लोगों ने बड़ा सहयोग किया है। इसलिए मैं इन सभी का आभार प्रकट करता हूं, धन्यवाद देता हूं और उन्हें लाल सलाम बोलता हूं।

सभापति महोदय, इस विधेयक में प्रत्येक परिवार को सौ दिनों के रोजगार की गारंटी, देश के लोगों के काम के अधिकार के प्रति एक मजबूत कदम है। महोदय, हमारे कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम में शुरू में हमारा वचन था कि डेढ़ सौ जिलों में फूड फॉर वर्क प्रोग्राम शुरू किया जाएगा। हमारे यहां काम के लिए भोजन योजना लागू है। अब उन डेढ़ सौ जिलों में पचास जिले और जोड़े जाएंगे। इस तरह से दो सौ जिलों में यह कार्यक्रम चलाया जाएगा। महोदय, देश में लगभग 600 जिले हैं जिन में से एक-तिहाई जिलों से इस की शुरूआत होगी और 5 वर्षों के अंदर ही देशभर में तमाम रूरल एरिया में, रूरल इंडिया में यह चलाया जाएगा।

महोदय, महात्मा गांधी कहा करते थे कि जब तक गांवों का विकास नहीं होगा, तब तक देश का विकास नहीं होगा। इसलिए हम रूरल इंडिया के लिए यह कार्यक्रम ला रहे हैं। महोदय, ''इंडिया शाइनिंग'' केवल नारों में नहीं, असल में गांवों में इस कार्यक्रम को लागू किया जाएगा और इस के लिए यह विधेयक लाया गया है। महोदय, 15 अगस्त को प्रधान मंत्री जी ने लाल किले की प्राचीर से एलान किया कि रोजगार बढ़ाओ और गरीबी हटाओ क्योंकि बेरोजगारी नहीं हटेगी तो गरीबी नहीं मिटेगी और गरीबी जब तक नहीं हटेगी, बेरोजगारी नहीं मिटेगी। इसलिए रोजगार बढ़ाओ और गरीबी हटाओ, वह भी उन की तरह केवल नारों में नहीं, भाषण में नहीं, महोदय, वहां 15 तारीख को एलान किया गया और यहां आज हम 24 तारीख को इस उच्च सदन

में आप के निर्देशन में पारित करने के लिए यह बिल आ गया हैं अब यह परित होकर जाएगा। यह हम केवल भाषणा में नहीं कह रही हैं, हम आप को हिसाब जोड़कर बताते हैं। महोदय, ग्रामीण विकास मंत्रालय पहले भी था और उस में हजार, डेढ़ हजार व दो हजार करोड़ की सालाना बढ़ोतरी होती थी। अब हमारा यूपीए का राज आया है। वे 16 हजार करोड़ रुपए छोड़कर गए थे अब उसे 24 हजार करोड़ किया गया है, मतलब ग्रामीण विकास में 53 फीसदी बढ़ोतरी हुई है।

महोदय, यह जो ग्रामीण विकास कार्यक्रम आएगा, जब यह रोजगार गारंटी कानून लागू हो जाएगा, तो बजट में और बढ़ोत्तरी होगी। इसलिए, मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं कि यह देश केवल भाषण से या नारे से नहीं चलाया जा सकता । महोदय, यह एक बड़ा देश है। यह देश चालाकी से नहीं चलाया जा सकता और न चालाकी से यह देश बन सकता है। इसलिए उस तरफ सच्चाई के साथ ठोस कदम उठाना होगा। महोदय, मैं यह दावा नहीं करता कि केवल इस विधेयक के आ जाने से बेकारी और गरीबी हट जाएगी, लेकिन यह अब तक के इतिहास में उस तरफ एक ठोस कदम होगा। सन् 1977 में भी "काम के लिए भोजन योजना" चली थी, पहले National Rural Employment कानून, रूरल लैंडलेस एम्प्लायमेंट प्रोग्राम, आदि चले थे। जवाहर ग्राम रोजगार योजना, जवाहर ग्रामीण समृद्धि योजना, Employment Assurance Scheme, ये सारी स्कीमें चल चुकी हैं, लेकिन इनसे गांवों में कुछ लोगों को काम मिला या नहीं मिला, कोई निश्चित नहीं था, लेकित महोदय, अब कम-से-कम सौ दिनों के रोजगार की गारंटी होगी, जो काम करना चाहेंगे, उस परिवार के लिए। पहले poor household था, पूअर को हटाया है। एवरी हाउस होल्ड, जो कोई भी काम करना चाहे, तब गांवों से शहरों की ओर लोगों का पलायन रुकेगा। महोदय, इसमें एंटी रूरल, एंटी पूअर लॉबी भी देश में सक्रिय हो गई है। बजट कहां से आएगा? यह गरीब का खर्च, गरीब को रोज़गार देने की बात हो रही है। खर्चा कहां से आएगा? दुरुपयोग हो जाएगा। महोदय, यह भी चल रहा है। दुरुपयोग हो जाएगा, जो भेजा जाता है, वह नहीं पहुंचेगा, ये सारे सवाल उठने लगे हैं, लेकिन मैं उसको बुरा नहीं मानता हूं। वे हमें और सावधान तथा सजग कर रहे हैं तथा हमें और भी मजबूती प्रदान कर रहे हैं। हमको खुशी है कि हम गरीब की तरफ आगे चल रहे हैं। हमारा लक्ष्य है कि 15 वर्षों के अन्दर हमारे देश से गरीबी और बेकारी की बिदाई हो जाए, यह समाप्त हो जाए। हमने इसमें 5 वर्ष का टार्गेट रखा है। अभी जो 14 वीं लोकसभा चल रही है, उसकी आयु लगभग 4 साल अभी बाकी हैं कई लोगों को इससे चिन्ता हो जाती है। यह विधेयक और गरीबोन्मुखी काम और हमारा जो कमिटमेंट है, कथनी और करनी में जो समानता है, बराबरी है, इससे कोई संदेह नहीं है कि आगे आने वाला समय भी हमारे यूपीए का होगा। हम अभी जितनी बहुमत में हैं और आगे 15वीं लोक सभा में इससे और भी ज्यादा बहुमत से आएंगे, इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं है । ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया : क्या बिल इसीलिए लाया है? ...(व्यवधान)... क्या बिल इसीलिए लाया है?...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद : महोदय, बिहार में चुनाव है, ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति : बोलने दीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)...बोलने दीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: बिहार में चुनाव होगा, तब आप वहां फिर पटखनी खाइएगा। वहां की जनता तैयार है। वहां की जनता का इरादा साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियों को चूर-चूर करने का है और वह होगा। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): साम्प्रदायिक शक्ति हम नहीं हैं। ...(व्यवधान)... साम्प्रदायिक पार्टी मुस्लिम लीग उनकी सरकार में है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति : आप बैठ जाओ। ...(व्यवधान)...आप बैठ जाओ। ...(व्यवधान)...बैठिए। बैठिए।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: महोदय, न्यूनतम मजदूरी क्या होगी? हमने अभी निश्चय किया है, बिल में भी प्रावधान किया है। देश भर में विभिन्न किस्म की मजदूरी लागू है। मिनिमम वेजेज एक्ट, 1948 के सैक्शन 3 के अधीन सब राज्यों में अपना अलग-अलग मिनिमम वेज लागू है। वह लागू रहेगा, हम उसको डिस्टर्ब नहीं करेंगे, लेकिन कोई विशेष परिस्थिति आएगी तो हमारे इस कानून में प्रावधान है कि कोई खास परिस्थिति आने पर हमको मिनिमम वेजेज तय करने का अधिकार रहेगा, जो किसी भी हालत में 60 रुपए प्रति दिन से कम का नहीं होगा। महोदय, हमने इस बिल में न्यूनतम मजदूरी का प्रावधान किया है। बेकारी भत्ते की दर के बारे में प्रावधान किया गया है कि यह उनकी एक माह की जो न्यूनतम मजदूरी होगी, उसका चौथाई एक महीने तक, उसके बाद भी यदि हम उनको अगले महीने तक काम नहीं दे पाएंगे, तो उनकी न्यूनतम मजदूरी का आधार उसको मिलेगा। यदि किसी ने अपना नाम रजिस्टर कराया है और हम साल भर तक उसको काम नहीं दे पाए, तो उसे उतना बेकारी भत्ता मिलेगा, जितनी न्यूनतम मजदूरी उन्हें सौ दिनों में काम करने में मिलती, उतना उनको बेकारी भत्ता दिया जाएगा।

महोदय, इसीलिए यह कड़ा कानून बनाया गया है कि किसी भी हालत में उनको रोजगार की गारंटी दी जाए, रोजगार मुहैया कराया जाए। इसके लिए केन्द्रीय नियोजन गारंटी परिषद और राज्य नियोजन गारंटी परिषद् कर केन्द्र और राज्य स्तर पर गठन करने की व्यवस्था की गई है। इसमें ग्राम पंचायतों की अहम भूमिका होगी। महाराष्ट्र में भी एम्प्लॉयमेंट गारंटी कानून लागू है, लेकिन उसमें ग्राम पंचायतों की कोई भूमिका नहीं है, कोई श्रेय नहीं है। लेकिन, इसमें ग्राम पंचायतों को

अहम भूमिका, प्रिंसिपल जिम्मेदारी दी गई है। देशभर में चुने हुए 30 लाख प्रतिनिधि, जिनमें एक तिहाई महिलाएं और अनुसूचित जाति व जनजाति के लोग, जो गांवों के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधि हैं, उनको हमने प्रिंसिपल रोल दिया है। ग्राम सभा को अधिकार दिया है और भारत के संविधान की धारा 243 में जो ग्राम सभा का वर्णन है, उल्लेख है, उनको हमने जिम्मेदारी दी है सोशल ऑडिट करने की, योजनाओं का चयन करने की, कार्यान्वयन करने की, सब देख-रेख करने की, निगरानी करने की, उनका फुल मॉडिफिकेशन करने की। ग्राम सभा स्तर तक, ग्राम पंचायत स्तर तक, तालुका पंचायत स्तर तक, जिला पंचायत स्तर तक, सभी स्तरों पर उनकी महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका होगी और उनको असिस्ट करने के लिए तालुका लैवल पर प्रोग्राम आफिसर की नियुक्ति का भी हमने प्रावधान किया है और जिला स्तर पर डिस्ट्रिक्ट कोआर्डिनेटिंग आफिसर, जो समन्वयक होगा, का इंतजाम किया गया है। इसलिए ग्राम पंचायतों की अहम भूमिका और उनकी सहायता के लिए एक प्रोग्राम आफिसर की बहाली का इसमें प्रावधान है।

निधि के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि स्टेट एम्प्लॉयमेंट गारंटी फंड, नेशनल एम्प्लॉयमेंट गारंटी फंड, इन सबका प्रावधान किया गया है। राज्यों की चिंता थी, क्योंकि राज्यों को जिम्मेदारी दी गई है, जो खर्चा होगा, उसका 60 फीसदी लेबर कम्पोनेंट पर, मजदूरी पर और 40 फीसदी मैटीरियल कम्पोनेंट पर होगा। यदि सिर्फ मजदूरी का हम प्रावधान रखेंगे तो परमानेंट असैट, स्थायी सम्पत्ति का सृजन नहीं होगा, इसलिए 40 फीसदी मैटीरियल कॉस्ट का प्रावधान रखा है, जिसमें सैंट-परसैंट लेबर पर जो कॉस्ट आएगी, वह केन्द्र की जिम्मेदारी होगी, हमने जिम्मेदारी ली है कि वह सारा खर्चा हम करेंगे, हम सब भुगतान करेंगे। कोई उधार नहीं,एडवांस में उनके फंड में पैसा जमा रहेगा। राज्य सरकारों को इस चिंता से मुक्त किया गया है कि किसी भी हालत में, पैसे की कमी के चलते यदि उनको अनएम्प्लॉयमेंट अलाऊंस देना पडा तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी हमारी होगी। इसलिए पैसा नहीं रहने के कारण यदि अनएम्प्लॉयमेंट वेज देना पड़ा तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी हमारी होगी। हमारा पैसा नहीं रहने के कारण यदि अनएम्प्लॉयमेंट अलाऊंस राज्य सरकारों को देना पड़ा तो उनके घाटे की आपूर्ति, कम्पेनसेशन का जिम्मा केन्द्र सरकार ने लिया है। हम एडवांस में पैसा उनके यहां जमा करेंगे, क्वार्टर्ली फंड का उपबंध होगा, उनको पैसे की कमी नहीं होने दी जाएगी।

फिर, उसमें कौन-कौन से काम लिए जाएंगे, इसकी हमने उसमें प्राइआरिटी दी हुई है। महोदय, आपने चिंता व्यक्त की है, आने वाले समय में देशभर में पानी का संकट हो सकता है। विशेषज्ञ, ज्ञानी लोग बताते हैं कि आने वाले समय में पानी का संकट हो सकता है। कभी विभिन्न जिलों में, कभी अधिकांश जिलों में सूखा, कभी पानी की कमी, इससे हम जूझ रहे हैं। इसलिए वाटर कंज़रवेशन को उसमें टॉप प्राइआरिटी दी गई है। वाटर कंज़रवेशन, वाटर सेव मैनेजमेंट, रेन

वाटर हारवेस्टिंग, पानी का संचय, पानी को व्यवस्था-इरिगेशन के लिए, सिंचाई के लिए, नहर के लिए, डैम आदि के लिए और ड्रॉट प्रूफिंग, फ्लड प्रूफिंग अपने देश के कुछ इलाकों में वाटर लॉगिंग है, जल जमाव है, इसलिए जल निकासी, बाढ़ रोकना आदि ये सारे काम उसमें किए जा सकते हैं। फिर, महोदय, फॉरेस्ट्री है, जंगल लगाने का काम भी, लैंड डेवलपमेंट का काम भी उसमें हैं कौन-सी जमीन में काम होगा? सारी जमीन में काम होगा। केवल सरकारी जमीन में ही नहीं, बल्कि अनुसूचित जाति, जनजाति की जमीनों में भी काम को हमने स्वीकृति दी है। उसके बाद, जो उसमें लैंड रिफॉर्म्स से लाभान्वित लोग हैं, बैनिफिशरीज़ हैं, उनकी जमीन तक भी उसका लाभ पहुंचाया जाएगा, जो इंदिरा आवास के हकदार हैं, उनकी जमीन में भी हमने इसके लिए सहमति दी है एवं इसके लिए प्रावधान भी किया हैं। महोदय, इसलिए किस जमीन में और कहां-कहां काम हो सकता है, क्या-क्या काम हो सकता है, यह कार्य केवल इतना छोटा ही नहीं है। अपने देश का विस्तार बहुत अधिक है, भिन्न-भिन्न इलाकों में भिन्न-भिन्न समस्याएं हैं, इसलिए यदि आज कोई राज्य सरकार अपने राज्य में और कोई नया प्रान्त जोड़ना चाहे तब in consultation with the State Government एक केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह अधिकार होगा, हमने राज्य सरकार के परामर्श से इस काम को भी इसमें जोड़ने का प्रावधान किया है महोदय, कुल मिला कर इसमें पीपुल्स पार्टिसिपेशन होने के कारण इसमें स्ट्रिक्ट विजिलेंस, ट्रांसपेरेंसी, एकाउनटबिलिटी, इन सबका कठोरता से पालन किया जाएगा। यहां पर एंटी रूरल, एंटी पूअर लॉबी के जो सदस्य हैं, जो हिसाब जोड़ कर बताते हैं कि इसका दुरुपयोग हो जाएगा, और जिन तक इसका लाभ पहुंचना चाहिए, वह नहीं पहुंचता है, तो मैं उन्हें बताना चाहूंगा कि उन तक इसे पहुंचाने का सारा काम राज्य सरकार के सहयोग से, जिला पंचायत के सहयोग से होगा और साथ ही जो सत्ता पक्ष के तमाम माननीय सदस्य बैठे हैं, हमें उन सबसे भी सहयोग की अपेक्षा हैं इन सबकी निगरानी में, सबकी देखभाल में ही कार्य होगा और सबकी मुस्तैदी इस कार्य के लिए अपेक्षित हैं। हमने सभी पार्टियों के माननीय नेताओं से प्रार्थना की है कि अपने-अपने कार्यकर्ताओं को वे यह बताएं कि ग्रामीण विकास की योजनाओं को, खासकर इस समय जो राज़गार गारंटी कानून आया है, इस कानून को सफल बनाने के लिए वे अपना पूरा सहयोग दें। इसमें कहीं गड़बड़ी न हो, सामान ठीक ढंग से अपने गंतव्य तक पहुंचे, इसके लिए इस कार्य में पूरी ट्रांसपेरेंसी और पारदर्शिता होनी चाहिए और इसमें पूरी मुस्तैदी की आवश्यकता रहेगी। इस कार्यक्रम को गरीबों तक पहुंचाने के लिए सभी अपने कार्यकर्ताओं को प्रेरित और निर्देशित करें। इसके लिए हमसे प्रशिक्षण की, जानकारी की, काग़ज-पत्रों की अथवा अन्य किसी चीज़ की, जो भी सहायता हो सकेगी, वह सब हम करने को तैयार हैं। जिस देश में उत्कृष्ट समाजसेवी संस्थाएं एवं कार्यकर्ता इस कार्य में लगे हुए हैं, फिर चाहे राजनैतिक दल हों, एनजीओज़ हों, समाजशास्त्री हों, एक्टिविस्ट हों, सोशल एक्टिविस्ट हों, जिस देश में से सब जुटे हुए हैं, वह कार्य अवश्य पूरा होगा, इस सदन के माध्यम से हम उन सबका आहवान करते हैं, उन सभी से प्रार्थना करते हैं कि

इस गरीबोन्मुखी और बेकारी को मिटाने वाले कानून में सभी लोग रात-दिन एक करके सहयोग करें और इसे सफल बनाएं। महोदय, इस कार्य के लिए मुझे यहां से भी बहुत अपेक्षाएं हैं, क्योंकि यह एक उच्च सदन है और यहां पर एक से एक काबिल, एक से एक ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्रीमती बृन्दा कारत (पश्चिमी बंगाल): आपने महिलाओं की बात को छोड़ दिया है।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: जी हां, आपने बहुत अच्छा किया जो मुझे याद दिला दिया, हमारे देश में जो फूड फॉर ऑल कार्यक्रम लागू है, हमने हिसाब लगाया है कि उसमें 34 फीसदी महिलाओं ने मज़दूरी का काम किया है। इस प्रकार 34 फीसदी महिलाएं तो उसमें हैं ही साथ ही हमने इसके लिए यह भी कहा है कि इस कार्यक्रम में एक-तिहाई तक प्रियॉरिटी महिलाओं को दी जाएगी और उनके कार्य में उन्हें पूरा सहयोग भी दिया जाएगा। महोदय, केवल इतना ही नहीं, वहां पर यदि कोई महिला काम करने के लिए आती है, उसके छोटे-छोटे बच्चे हो सकते हैं, तो जहां पर पांच वर्ष की उम्र के कम से कम पांच बच्चे एकत्र हो जाते हैं, उनके लिए अलग से आया का इंतजाम किया जाएगा। उनके लिए पीने के पानी का, रहने का, खाने-पीने का समस्त इंतजाम, उसी स्थान पर किया जाएगा, यह भी इस विधेयक में है। महिलाओं को कोई असुविधा न हो इसके लिए उन्हें पांच किलोमीटर के एरिया के अंदर ही काम दिया जाएगा और यदि कहीं इससे अधिक दूर जाने की नौबत आती है, तब उन्हें आने-जाने के लिए यात्रा भत्ता भी दिया जाएगा।

महोदय, यह गरीबोन्मुखी विधेयक है और नेशनल कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम के प्रथम भाग में हमारा यह कमिटमेंट भी है। इस कार्य को पूरा करने के लिए लोक सभा के तमाम माननीय सदस्यों ने अपना समर्थन प्रदान किया है, साथ ही देश भर से व्यापक समर्थन प्राप्त हुआ है, इसके लिए सभी में बहुत अधिक उत्साह है। गांवों में भी इसकी लहर फैल गई है और वे लोग कहते है कि हमें अब शहरों की ओर नहीं जाना पड़ेगा।

महोदय, अंत में मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं कि बहुत से लोग इसके खिलाफ भी यहां-वहां चर्चाएं कर रहे हैं। जब भी गरीबों के लिए कोई भी लाभप्रद कार्यक्रम आने लगता है तो उससे कुछ लोगों को परेशानी होने लगती है कि गरीबों के लिए कोई भी कार्यक्रम क्यों आ रहा हैं इसके संबंध में मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि देश भर के गांवों में जो 72 करोड़ लोग, गरीब आदमी, किसान, मज़दूर, बेरोज़गार और अन्य लोग हैं, उन्हें यदि बैंकों के परिप्रेक्ष्य में देखा जाए तो सेल्फ इम्प्रूवमेंट प्रोग्राम के तहत 98 प्रतिशत रिकवरी उनकी ओर से है। डेढ़ लाख रुपये का नॉन परफॉर्मिंग एसेट गरीब लोगों ने नहीं डुबाया है, उसे किसने डुबाया है, इसे वे लोग ही जानें।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (झारखंड): आप अपनी अंगुली पीछे की ओर भी घुमाइए, इधर ही क्यों घुमा रहे हैं।

श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह: इस बात को अर्थशास्त्री लोग बताएं, हम इसे समझना चाहते हैं क्योंकि गांव के गरीब आदमियों के अन्दर परचेज़िंग कैपेसिटी नहीं रहेगी। कार्पोरेट और उद्योग कैसे चलेगा? अगर हमारे गरीब आदमी की क्षमता नहीं रहेगी, तो बाल्टी कौन खरीदेगा, कपड़ा कौन खरीदेगा, दवाई कौन खरीदेगा, उद्योग-धंधा कैसे चलेगा? इसलिए कारपोरेट जगत को जो बचाना चाहते हैं और जो बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, उनके लिए भी जरूरी है कि गांव से गरीबी और बेकारी हटे। जब हमारे गांव के आदमी की परचेजिंग कैपेसिटी रहेगी, तब उद्योग भी बढ़ेगा, फलेगा फूलेगा, नहीं तो इसमें कहां से आयेगा? अनप्रोडक्टिव है, कौन कहता है कि अनप्रोडक्टिव है? जो खर्चा होगा, वहां sustainable employment generation होगा, वहां पर हरियाली आयेगी, जो सूखी जमीन है, उसमें मॉयश्चर होगा, सिंचाई का प्रबंध होगा, वहां हरियाली आयेगी, तब काम भी मिलेगा, रोजगार भी मिलेगा।

महोदय, महाराष्ट्र का उदाहरण है कि वहां का अनार विदेश में जा रहा है, वहां का संतरा विदेश में जा रहा है। हार्टिकल्चर वहां डेवलेप किया, एम्पलायमेंट गांरटी कानून के चलते। जब पानी का जल संचयन हुआ, पानी की व्यवस्था हुई, तो हार्टिकल्चर में भी तरक्की हुई। महोदय, इसलिए सभी बातों का ख्याल रखते हुए, हमने कहा कि पहले से wage-employment programme लागू है। केन जो ब्रिटेन के मशहूर अर्थशास्त्री हैं, उनका कहना है कि ऐसे मुफ्त में ही कोई चीज़ नहीं दी जाये, बल्कि काम कराकर जनता को कुछ दिया जाये। उसके हिसाब से वेज हार्ड मैन्युअल लेबर स्कीम पुराने जमाने से चली आ रही है और जितना वेज एम्पलायमेंट प्रोग्राम चला, जो अभी तक चलता आया है, लेकिन रोजगार गांरटी का कानून अभी तक नहीं था। मैं नहीं जानता हूं कि दुनिया में और कहीं यह है या नहीं, लेकिन सबसे पहले हमारे यहां देशभर में इतना बड़ा कार्यक्रम, जनाकांक्षी गरीबों के लिए यह कानून आ रहा है-रोजगार गांरटी कानून। इसलिए हम सदन से प्रार्थना करेंगे कि इसको पारित किया जाये।

महोदय, इतना ही नहीं, अमर्त्य सेन जो दुनिया के मशहूर अर्थशास्त्री हैं, नोबल पुरस्कार विजेता हैं, उनसे हाल ही में Argumentative India के संबंध में जो पूछताछ हुई, उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि नेशनल रूरल एम्पलायमेंट गांरटी बिल देश के लिए बड़ा लाभदायक है, गरीब के लिए और गांव के विकास के लिए बड़ा लाभदायक है। महादेय, यह मशहूर अर्थशास्त्री का हाल ही में दिया हुआ बयान है। इसीलिए हम सदन से प्रार्थना करते हैं कि इस ऐतिहासिक विधेयक को पारित किया जाये। हमारी जिम्मेदारी है कि नेशनल कामन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम का नम्बर एक का जो कमिटमेंट है, उसको पूरा करने के लिए, सितम्बर 2004 में बिल आया, 21 दिसम्बर 2004 को लोक सभा ने दिया, स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में गया और स्टैंडिंग कमेटी से इस सत्र में जुलाई में आया। इसे लोक सभा के माननीय सदस्यों ने, लोक सभा ने पारित किया है। मेरी आपसे और सदन से प्रार्थना

है कि इतना मशहूर, ऐतिहासिक, गरीबोन्मुखी और बेकारी को समाप्त करने वाला जो यह विधेयक है, इसको विचारार्थ करके पारित किया जाये। इस संबध में माननीय सदस्यों के जो सुझाव आयेंगे, उनका हम स्वागत करेंगे और उन पर अमल करेंगे। सभी सदस्यों को धन्यवाद देते हुए और आपका आभार प्रकट करते हुए, मैं यही प्रार्थना करता हूं कि इस विधेयक को जानदार, शानदार ढंग से पारित किया जाये। धन्यवाद।

The question was proposed.

SHRI BALAVANT *ALIAS* BAL APTE (Maharashtra): Sir, I am grateful to you for this opportunity. Sir, I have the onerous task of responding to this flamboyantly eloquent assault, which was really a relentless assault, almost like a pre-emptive strike, with some rational approach. Sir, we are here to discuss the National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2005 as passed by the Lok Sabha. Sir probably, with his speech, the hon. Minister wanted this House to pass the Bill without discussion. But it is not going to be so. This House is going to discuss the Bill.

Sir, we are going through this legislation and we are in the process of passing it in a kind of tearing haste, and almost by habit, I find that when you talk about haste, acting in haste, you always are apprehensive of repenting in leisure.

So, this tearing haste should not, I hope, lead us to repentance because this haste is reflected in the formulation and the passage of this Bill. "हर हाथ को काम और हर खेत को पानी" was the dream put forward by Shri Deen Dayal Upadhaya 40 years ago, and that has been the cherished dream of this country. But, Sir, today we are not discussing dreams only, but we are also passing a law which will create certain enforceable rights and certain obligatory liabilities. Sir, any Government functions through certain policies and through its law-making. Both are the functions of the Government. But, there is a qualitative difference between the two. In so far as the Government's policy is concerned, it is a matter of expression of intent. And, if it is exposed, you find that expression of intent was hollow. I have the example of the National Education Policy of 1986 which formulated the universalisation of education, and, I believe, in the Planning Commission, at that moment, the relevant Member (Education) was Prof. M.G.K. Menon, who said, "We don't have even a pie for this project". So,

a policy formulation was there and there was failure. But, sir, when you enact a statute, it is a commitment of Parliament to the people. A statute is not merely a commitment, but it creates enforceable rights for the people. Therefore, everybody has to think more while passing a law, because it is supposed to be implemented. When I was referring to the National Education Policy, I was reminded of an axiomatic saying by Prof. D.S. Kothari, who produced the earlier Education Commission Report. He said that a report is no substitute to an action. Therefore, a dream brought on paper is no substitute for an action. And, I believe that the present legislation is fated to be disillusionment because (i) there was no homework, (ii) there was no ground assessment and, (iii) there was no understanding of a future prospective. Therefore, I am afraid, at the implementation level, this legislation is facing a darker future. Sir, in so far as the homework is concerned, I find firstly that the bulk of the legislation is on the basis of implementation by the States, and States are, at no stage, involved in the making of this law. They are not involved; they are not consulted. It was clear when the Secretaries of the States gave evidence before the Standing Committee. Without their involvement, this legislation can't be successful and they are not involved at any stage so far.

Secondly, Sir, the financial implication ought to have been studied beforehand. But that has not been done. Wherefrom the money will come? Nobody knows it. Even the Finance Minister does not know. He says, "we will find money somewhere". In such circumstances, Sir, it is always said if your conclusions are wrong, check your premises.

In the present scheme of things, the premises are that there is umemployment there are finances, and, therefore, employment is guaranteed. But here it is the other way round. What kind of unemployment is there is not assessed. From where will the finances come? Nobody knows. And, therefore, I believe, the conclusion is that there is no guarantee of getting employment.

(ii) Secondly, sir, there is no ground assessment before passing this legislation. Today, there are several schemes working. In fact, there is a long list. And the physical performance-of these schemes- is noted by the Economic Survey of 2004-05. The National Food-for-work Programme was started in November, 2004, in which Rs. 2,020 crores were invested and twenty lakh tonnes of foodgrains were made available. The

Swarnajayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana (SGSY)-the bureaucrats talks in these terminologies, SGSY or SGRY, which I do not understand immediately-was initiated in April, 1999. The Sampoorna Grameen Rojgar Yojana (SGRY) was initiated in 2001; it was to be implemented through Panchayati Raj institutions. Then the Rural Employment Generation Programme (REGP) was initiated in 1995, and the Report says that 8.32 lakh jobs were created up to 2003-04, and 5.25 lakh jobs were to be created during 2004-05. Then there is the Prime Minister's Rojgar Yojana (PMRY), which was initiated in 1993. Under it, self-employment units so far, are 20 lakhs, and the target for 2004-05 was 16.50 lakh employment opportunities. The Swarnajayanti Shahari Rojgar Yojana (SJSRY) was initiated in 1997, and the Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) was initiated in 1993.

Sir, apart from these, there are several other schemes for rural development which essentially are the schemes for rural employment. What is the yield of all these schemes? What is the correlation between the money spent and the employment generated? And then, what remains to be done? Nobody has studied it. And, Sir, if these or any of these schemes have failed, and inquiry is necessary as to why it has failed. If the earlier schemes has failed due to certain reasons, without eradicating those reasons, any scheme for rural employment is bound to fail. Therefore, I am saying that no ground assessment is made before going into this legislation.

Sir, I remember, every year when a Railway Minister presents his Budget, he sanctions several schemes, and then certain allocation is made for each of those schemes. If there are several Ministers within a period of 5-6 years, then so many schemes are sanctioned. Each schemes is given certain amount of money. Therefore, there are 100 projects pending—100 projects at a stage where some money is spent, much more is to be spent, and they continue to be pending. We have scores of such examples in any report of the Railway Convention Committee. Sir, if there are already 10-20 schemes, and one more scheme is going to be added to these; some money is spent on the earlier schemes without results, some more money will be spent on the scheme without results; and therefore, we will be having schemes but no results.

(iii) The third congenital defect in this legislation is that there is no understanding, no assessment of a future perspective. What projects

are we going to undertake? How much money is going to be spent on each of them?

In these projects, how many people will be employed? When the Ministry was asked, the Ministry said that the data in so far as people above the poverty line are concerned, is not maintained. So, there is no data. This makes everything vague, everything doubtful and doesn't generate confidence; there is no question of guarantee. And, Sir, I would like to mention here that apart from those who are unemployed, there are ten crore agricultural labourers who must be treated almost as unemployed because they are never employed throughout the year.

Sir, now, I seek to come to the Bill itself and it abounds, again, in defects. Sir, only one substantial amendment on the basis of the Standing Committee's Report was accepted. It the other amendments proposed were accepted, the Bill would have taken a different shape. And that one amendment is from 'poor' household to 'every' household. The word 'poor' is omitted and, therefore, all calcuations have gone haywrie. The Financial memorandum is based on the concept of every poor household, where they have calculated such able-bodied persons to be about ten crore, accumulated in 3.86 families. I don't find any other word for accumulated, but people belonging to 3.86 families. For them, for 100 days, you will require 1,00,464 crores. All these calculations are on this and there also, they say we may not be required to spend this much because every person doesn't ask for a job. Those who demand job may be only fifty per cent. Therefore, we may be required to spend only fifty thousand crore. But that calculation is on the basis that you have to cater to ten crore. The moment you talk of removing 'poor' in every household, then you refer to 38.91 crore of able-bodied persons, not only men, between 18 and 64 age group. Where are the calculations for this, even the rudimentary calculations? And if 100,464 crore is a tall order, four-folds of this will be an order of such a nature that you will lose your cap when looking up. Therefore, one amendment has put the legislation in a state of being haywire.

Sir, the Finance Minister said that we will find money somewhere. I tried to find that 'somewhere' and I found that 26,500 crore is allocated to the social sector; out of which, eight thousand crore is for rural structure and development, part of it can be for rural employment. Even if you

consider those eight thousand crore and compare it with 40,000 crore, then, where would you find that money, is a question which is not answered. So, we have only a fraction of the requirement on paper. Otherwise, we don't know where the money will come from?

Now, the second aspect is that the States are the implementing agencies. As I mentioned earlier, the States are not involved and they are not going to spend anything. We find that here, in the Question Hour, whenever a question is asked about the money being sent to a particular State, we find that the contribution by the State is not forthcoming. Therefore, further instalment is not sent.

The Centre does not send money because the State does not want to spend, and therefore, does not want to spend the Centre's money also. The Secretaries, as I have mentioned earlier, have made it clear to the Standing Committee that the States will not be able to spend anything on this.

Thirdly, now, Sir, I come to the projects. Yes, the Schedule mentions the category of projects to be undertaken, and both things are considered there. But as I have said earlier, हर हाथ को काम, हर खेत को पानी. So, irrigation facilities are given the priority. All kinds of water harvesting, and then, rural connectivity is also there. But it is only a categorization. When you go to the implementation level, there should, at least, be a study. Everything may not be done in the legislation, and in this House. I appreciate that. What will be the locations, what will be the cost, what will be the cost of other infrastructure?, There is a rough and ready estimate of 60:40. But we know that we need the skilled personnel and other infrastructure. The Kerala Government has said that 6 per cent of any project is spent on this. Otherwise, Sir, without this home work, there will be money spent, project named, the employed will be अपने घर में, no payment to him, as is happening in many cases in Maharashtra. The lessons of Maharashtra have to be learnt. The scheme is working there for the last 31 years. Only the other day, it came in the newspapers that there was a scam of about Rs. 9 crores in one small village. No project, no money spent, the people are on the muster roll who are dead, and only Rs. 9 crores in one small project, and we are covering the entire country. So, these lessons have to be learnt, which I believe, have not been considered.

Forthly, Sir, we are talking about the minimum wage of Rs. 60/- or Rs. 66/-. Section 8 of the Minimum Wages Act contemplates the establishment of an Advisory Board which is there, and I know that the Advisory Board is seized of a national wage, of a national floor level minimum wage. Let the Advisory Board go into it. It has representatives of the workers, it has representatives of the employers. That Board will come to a very reasonable figure. This Rs. 60/- or Rs. 66/- is not a reasonable figure, and you can request the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board probably meets casually once a year because, it is obligatory to call the meeting. Activate it and you will get the results. It has to be a national floor level minimum wage which can be variable on the higher side, according to the circumstances, in a particular State.

Fifthly, the machinery contemplated in this is again under a programme officer. We talked about the Panchayat Raj institutions. But that talk is meaningless because the programme officer is above them. He is going to be the sole decision-maker; he is going to be the sole person who will decide complaints, decide appeals and has the final authority. Sir, in this respect, we are still in that colonial mode where, for the British, Collector was their ultimate authority. We are following the same system, disrespecting the elected representatives of the people. Yes, politicians are corrupt. But, therefore, putting everything in the hands of bureaucracy, is more disastrous. Politicians are, at least, responsible to the people, and if the politician is at a lower level, he is more responsible. He has to face his town every day, he has to face his village every day.

And, therefore, Panchayati Raj Institutions will remain only on paper. This Programme Officer will control everything. And this has been done during the entire colonial rule. Therefore, Sir, during the freedom struggle, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said, "No new order can be built in India as long as the spirit of ICS pervades Administration." But, Sir, unfortunately, Pandit Nehru who had, said earlier. "The Civil Services were fossilised to bygone and obsolete methods", did say in 1948, after partition, because of uncertainties, said earlier,—and there are several other factors also, but I will not go into them—"One has to be careful of the steps one takes so as not to injure the existing structure too much." So he avoided injuring the existing structure. Even today, like the colonial rulers, we believe more in that existing structure of bureaucrats than our own people! And there lies the tragedy of this Scheme if it is to be handed over to a bureaucrat above the Panchayati Raj Institutions.

3.00 P.M.

Sixthly, Sir, we are concerned here with the citizen's statutory rights. Right to work ought to be fundamental right, but we always say that we don't want the Government to employ everybody, we don't want the governmentalisation of the economy! When you create a right for the citizen by a statute, even if it is not fundamental, it is a statutory right, enforceable at law. The enforcement and redressal machinery is conspicuous by its absence in this statute. Clause 19 talks of the States creating a machinery under the rules. It has to be a statutory machinery, with an appellate authority also, and, naturally, with natural justice as well as a time frame provided for redressal of grievances. That is absent. So, you are creating a right without its enforceability, which makes it useless.

Therefore, Sir, lastly, it is necessary for the implementation of this Scheme that the Centre assumes full responsibility; it does not leave any part of the financial burden on the States, and, as has been suggested by the Parliamentary Standing Committee, and as was suggested in the other House, implementation has to be done by the States, with full financial assistance from the Centre, and if it is not implemented, and, therefore, if a person is unemployed, then the unemployment allowance which is guaranteed under this should be paid by the States. So, it will be a kind of coercion on the States that if they do not implement, they will have to pay. The roles in the statue are to be reversed. First, the Centre pays, and if that payment is not utilised, then the State should pay. This is one way of ensuring success through the States. And, secondly, Sir, you have to empower the Panchayati Raj Institutions for this. The Seventy-third Amendment did this. But there is a great lacuna that ultimately, it is the State which is controlling the finances. If the money flows directly to the Gram Panchayats, through a proper Finance Commission, if necessary, by a Constitutional amendment, and, then, if money in this also goes directly to the Panchayats for implementation of the Scheme, the Scheme will be implemented, the Panchayats will perform, the people will participate. We are talking about participatory democracy, we are talking about transparency and we are talking about social audit. All that will be possible; plus the villages will have the projects of their choice, not those determined by some bureaucrats sitting in a chamber in the *Mantralaya* without knowing the ground realities.

Therefore, we hope, and hope is what sustains us....

आशानाम् मनुष्याणां श्रृंखला काचित् अद्भुता।

यया बद्धाः प्रश्धावन्ति मुक्ताः तिष्ठति पंगुवत्।।

Therefore, we run because we hope and I hope that the Government would take necessary steps to cure this and implement the scheme with all the vigour, finding all the money. Otherwise, it will be another scheme on paper. It will again remind us—he mentioned about Shri Rajiv Gandhi—what he said 20 years ago that one rupee, when it reaches to the last man, becomes 15 paise. So, let us save the 85 paise. Maybe, in cases like the one where I have said that the person whose name is on the muster roll was already dead, not even the 15 paise reach him. So, let us save that by doing something on that. With this caution, I wish this Government success in the implementation of this measure. Thank you.

SHRI R.K. DHAWAN (Bihar): Sir, with your permission, I rise to support the National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2005. At the outset, I would like to congratulate the UPA Government for having approved of, and the hon. Minister for having introduced, a very laudable piece of legislation.

Sir, Mr. Apte is a very senior learned colleague and I was looking forward to hear from him a very constructive approach towards the Bill. But I must confess that I am totally disappointed by the points raised by him which, according to me, are only made for the sake of criticising the policy or criticising the Bill. To most of the issues which he has raised, there are answers in the Bill itself. But of course, the hon. Minister will reply and deal with them.

Sir, the Bill fulfils one of the key electoral promises and an important programme of the UPA Government and it will not be an exaggeration, if I say that the Bill is a historical landmark. When India got freedom, a new era of hope dawned upon this vast ancient land. Those who spearheaded the freedom movements were aware that the real India lived in the villages. They were painfully also conscious of the plight of the poor and the downtrodden living in the villages. If we read the autobiography of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we will know that he travelled throughout the villages of the country on foot in the scorching heat and was inspired by the

vision that freedom for India would be nothing unless independent India rid the poor people, the landless farmers, the oppressed artisans of the scourge of poverty of which they have been victims for centuries. Even the Britishers, who managed the village administration, were only interested in collecting the land revenue and in no way helped these poor people. The leaders of the Indian National Congress did not forget that it was the poor people, the hapless people in rural India constituted India's backbone. But they became the victims of hideous famine that struck different parts of the country with no help coming from the Centre, with no help coming from the Government.

They were fully aware that a provision for relief in case of undeserved want was a common feature of modern States. In advanced countries, this feature had made much progress. The Congress leaders were concerned not only about inadequate assistance to the poor, they were more concerned about the dignity and respect of the people. They strongly believed that until and unless dignity and respect were restored to the people, until and unless the poor and the downtrodden people living in thousands of villages were provided with the means of ensuring their livelihood, mere financial assistance will not restore their dignity which had been lost over the centuries. That was their faith; that was their vision; that was their belief. And that was the vision of the framers of the Constitution when they enshrined the Directive Principles in the Constitution.

Sir, Article 41 makes a distinction between 'public assistance' and 'right to work'. The State was, however, enjoined to make provision for both.

So far as the right to work is concerned, it was considered so fundamental that three articles of the Constitution made provisions for it. Article 39(a) provides that the citizen, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood. Article 41 repeats that the State shall, within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing the right to work, apart from public assistance. Article 43 provides that the State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, a living wage.

Rural unemployment and its varying dimensions have been challenges since Independence. Right from the beginning, in the post-Independent

India, the Congress Governments have made tireless efforts to remove poverty and several other efforts in this respect were made and there were some achievements also. My friends in the Opposition, of course, will not agree with it because heavens cannot be brought to earth. The country had to look at the industrial development; the country had to look at the infrastructure; irrigation had to be improved. The policies and programmes initiated by the first Prime Minister of the Congress Government, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, are the testimony that he wanted to create infrastructure; he wanted to create industrialisation in the country and that is why there was a little delay in the implementation of the scheme to fully remove poverty from the country.

During 70s, when the country had a reasonable industrial capacity, 'Garibi Hatao' was the thrust area of Shrimati Indira Gandhi's economic policy. She created a massive wage employment as well as productive assets. Here 20-Point Programme had led to the eradication of poverty to a great extent.

Shri Rajiv Gandhi started the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana to fight rural unemployment. While addressing the Indian Engineering Congress on 10th January, 1987, at Calcutta, Shri Rajiv Gandhi said, "We must as a country, have our war on poverty, as our prime task and everything else must be linked to that." That was the thinking of Shri Rajiv Gandhi; that was the vision of Shri Rajiv Gandhi to remove poverty.

Sir, the present Bill is a gigantic effort towards realisation of this dream of India's freedom fighters and founding fathers of the Constitution. It is their dream which has been given a statutory shape under the inspiring leadership of the UPA Chairperson and Congress(I) President, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi. It was she, if you kindly recall, who gave a forceful expression to this at the C.M.'s Conference at Guwahati in 2002. Sir, during the General Elections of 2004, she travelled through the villages, slums and other rural places of the country, and mingled with the people working in the fields who were trying to eke out their livelihood, and she realised the problems that were being faced by the people at that time. That is why she was very keen to give a concrete shape to this Bill. Sir, the love and affection for the rural people, for the people living in the villages, is amply demonstrated in the will of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who very emotionally showed the deep concern and love in the most

positive manner when he said that his ashes should be scattered in the fields of India where teeming millions of farmers toiled in heat and cold. The Bill, which is being enacted, will become a reality and a harbinger of a revolutionary change in the country. Shrimati Sonia Gandhi rightly stated and I quote: "The present Bill builds on all these past initiatives. The Right to Information Bill and the Employment Guarantee Bill will form the twin pillars on which the effective implementation of 'Bharat Nirman' will rest." The people of India demonstrated their fate in her inspiring leadership, and I must say that all of us, excepting my friends from the opposite side, will agree that she did not fail them. She has proved their expectations. That will go down the history as an eloquent testimony of her commitment to the welfare of the poor people in rural India, and this is the first step which she took to shape the destiny of our countrymen who were oppressed with the grinding weight of poverty over the years, rather over the centuries. The proposed Bill is a simple but a radical way of tackling the gigantic problem. It is the requirement of any democratic nation that its poor do not fall off the road to economic prosperity. The UPA Government's decision to provide by legislation at least 100 days of employment to one member of every poor household is an effective and a decisive step in the direction of improving the socio-economic condition of the economically weaker sections of the society and is designed to protect the interests of the poor. The scheme will also provide ample opportunity to transform the rural infrastructure. The Bill, when enacted, will enable people to claim such a constitutional right to work. Sir, my friends in the Opposition who were shell-shocked by their defeat at the 2004 Lok Sabha elections and are trying desperately to come out of it, although they have not succeeded, perhaps may not like to endorse my views or may not agree with me that whenever there are non-Congress Governments in power at the Centre, there are always some aberrations and setbacks. This is the position which they, perhaps, may not like. Not very long ago, the country witnessed a joke, a repeated cacophony of creating hundred millions of jobs per year in the background of 'Shining India' or 'Feel Good India', which proved to be hollow-lock, stock and barrel. The overall employment, in fact, fell down during the NDA regime. During 1997 and 1998, when the labour force grew at the rate of 1.03 per cent annually, the employment grew at the rate of only 0.98 per cent leading to a further increase of unemployment. The rate of growth of unemployment during the 80s was 2.37 per cent per annum. Sir, I see

here that most of the members of the NDA Government have disappeared because they are not used to listen to the reality, because they believe only in 'Shining India' and 'Feel Good India' campaigns.

During the NDA regime, the rate of growth fell to 0.98 per cent. This shows that the rate of growth of employment, therefore, fell by about 79 per cent. This is the reality about their 'Feel-Good Factor' and their 'Shining India' campaign! The employment fell down by 79 per cent. Sir, the number of people employed in the public sector in the year 1991-92 was 2.8 per cent. In the year 2001-02, the number of people employed in the public sector was 1.99 million. This also shows that the total strength of employees in the public sector was reduced by two lakhs.

The Bill aims at providing for enhancement of livelihood, security of poor households in the rural areas. The Bill provides for one hundred days of employment to every household whose members volunteer to do manual work. Sir, through the Bill, it is possible to mobilise the rural people, This will, of course, immensely help in rural reconstruction.

Sir, we all know that poverty cannot be removed without the generation of employment. Therefore, the present Bill would go a long way in lifting the rural households out of poverty and hunder. The programme under the Bill could lead to a major decline in the standard indicators of judging the rural poverty because this will raise them from below the poverty line and bring them above the poverty line. Indicators will certainly change. The generated employment would also be a major source of employment for women because, if you go through the Bill, you will find that reservation has been provided for them. Certainly, they will get respectability in the family. It will also lead to a decline in the rural and urban migration because if work is available in the villages, why will they shift to the towns? The Bill will provide them this opportunity also. Sir, a reference was made by Shri Apte to certain schemes. This Bill is entirely different. Schemes come and schemes go. Schemes are at times, undermined for various reasons, at times by the bureaucracy, to which he also referred. But laws are always laws. Nobody will be able to change this law without the approval of the Parliament. So, there is a difference between a scheme and a law. Many schemes, to which Mr. Apte referred, were created without any legal sanction. This will have a legal sanction and nobody will be able to change it; nobody will be able to alter it; nobody will be able to change its shape,be

it bureaucracy, be they politicians, be they MLAs or be it Gram Panchayat. This is the difference between a scheme and a law.

Sir, the Bill, when passed, will make the administration accountable. He referred to the fact that the administration is not accountable. It will make them accountable. If employment is not provided, they will get unemployment allowance, and the administration will be answerable for it. Sir, this will also act as a penalty for the State administration. A reference was made as to why the State Governments should be asked to pay unemployment allowance and that it will be a burden on them. But we should look at it the other way round. If the States are not asked to pay the unemployment allowance, they will see to it that no employment is created in the State, because the State will get money from the Centre. If the Centre has to give the money even for the unemployed, then, why should the States bother to create jobs? I wish my friend had supported this clause; there should be this penalty that the unemployment allowance should be paid by the States. The Centre is bearing all the expenses but only putting this penalty on them. Sir, all of us are thankful to our Chairman, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, for her valuable intervention in making the Bill more efficacious. What was her intervention? The first is that the Centre should bear all the expenses because the States do not have resources and they cannot implement this programme and they cannot proceed with this programme because of paucity of funds.

Then, once the scheme is introduced, nobody shall be able to abandon it. Here also, I answer Mr. Apte's point that it may not be effective. But, here it is proposed that the scheme once approved, passed by the Parliament, shall not be open to withdrawal. And the third thing is, what they have done is that the Central Government's meeting the expenditure on account of the unemployment allowance. The fourth and the most important point was that the Panchayat should play an important role in the selection of works that are to be carried out. The elected Panchayats have been given this work. I am very happy to say that a reference to it has clearly been made in the Bill. I must congratulate the Government and the Minister that they have accepted the recommendations of the Chairperson of the UPA and have incorporated in the Bill — this is the most important clause which he referred to — I was referring to Panchayats — Clause 13. "The Panchayats at District, Intermediate and village level shall be the principal authorities for planning and

implementation of the schemes under this Act." This was the most important point which he had raised.

Sir, the States will have the responsibility of providing jobs within 15 days; otherwise, they will have to pay the penalty of unemployment allowance. Sir, this Bill assumes great importance because the Bill becomes the first national safeguard against unemployment. Secondly, a well-designed Employment Guarantee Programme has a major impact on rural reconstruction.

Sir, the Approach Paper to the Mid-term Appraisal of the Tenth Five Year Plan states, and I quote, "The employment growth should exceed growth of labour force to reduce the backlog of unemployment. Employment strategies advocated in the Approach Paper *inter-alia* include; the need to give special emphasis to promote public investment in rural areas for absorbing unemployed labour force for asset creation." So, the Bill is a right step in the right direction.

Sir, to further strengthen the grass-root democracy, as I read about clause 13, there is another provision in the Bill. The execution of the work — here also, a reference was made as to who will monitor this scheme — there is a specific provision in the Bill — is to be monitored by the Gram Sabhas and regular social audit of all projects under the Scheme are to be carried out as per Clause 17. So, there should not be any fear on this count. It is not that the scheme will only be audited and accounts will be submitted by the officials and the bureaucracy and all that. Here is a specific provision under clause 17 that such accounts are subject to audit.

Sir, to sensitise the implementation machinery and to keep the citizens in general and beneficiaries in particular at focus, Clause 19 provides for a grievance redressal machanism at block level and district level to deal with complaints. There used to be no such thing when the schemes were implemented. Now, here is a machinery, here is a mechanism that will deal with redressal of complaints for which a specific period has been mentioned in the Bill. When a complaint is made, the Programme Officer has to submit it to the concerned authorities, and they have to do it, Sir.

Sir, i don't know what is wrong when a scheme is made for poor people to uplift them, to make them rise a little above the poverty line, there is so

much uproar. After all, there are references of leakages; there are references of corruption. Leakages take place everywhere; allegations of corruption are everywhere. Does it mean that the whole work of the Government of the country should come to a standstill? At times, there were charges of corruption on defence matters in the Army. Does it mean that the Government should stop procuring equipment for the Army because there is corruption? There is a method today. We should have to check corruption. I don't think that we should allow them to leave. There should be a mechanism to check it. For that, provisions have been made in the Bill. After all, if you look at it very dispassionately, what are we going to give them? Through this Bill, we are only giving them an opportunity to show their ability to work. They will show their ability to work. They will offer themselves for work and that too for manual work. They will do the work and then, they will get the wages.

So, why is this all uproar? Then why should this Bill be enacted? What are we going to give them? Please think over. It is very limited. It is a fraction of what the privileged people have. Look at these people's privileges, what privileges these people have and what are we going to offer them.

Sir, I must confess that no civilised society can afford to prevent the needy a chance to earn his livelihood, that too from casual and manual labour, that too for a hundred days a year. Sir, it has been the experience and a reference was made to the public administration; it is said that public administration in India has failed. Sir, it has not failed because of any support from the Congress. It has failed because of paucity of funds. In States, at times, it has failed because the funds were diverted. They were not properly utilised for the purpose for which they were meant. To overcome that difficulty, Sir, a provision has been made in this Bill for the creation of a cell established —the National Employment Guarantee Fund. So, there will be no paucity of funds. The Central Government will give donations, credit, etc. Similarly, in the States too there will be such a fund. So, no scheme under this Bill will suffer from the problem of funds. You cannot say, "The schemes cannot go because there are no funds." So, this problem has been tackled.

Clauses 23 and 24 of the Bill require transparency and accountability at the implementation and an Audit Accounts Officer for this purpose. Sir,

for the first time, the poorest are going to be given a right to income every year, eventually in every part of the country. The Bill is quite comprehensive.

I would like to make three or four suggestions for the consideration of the hon. Minister. Sir, Schedule I of the list, about the types of work which can be undertaken under the scheme, well, to me it seems to be restricted. I think, it would be better if the Panchayats are also allowed to select schemes. They also should have powers to select schemes, because people at the Panchayat can, in their own area, spot, and be able to know, the schemes which would be in the interest of the people. If one addition is made, to say that the Panchayats will have the discretion to select items of work, that would be better.

Sir, it should also be explored whether the benefits of group housing insurance through Government-owned insurance corporations can be made available to the workers. Sir, the scheme would require massive funds. The estimates range from Rs. 30,000 crores to Rs. 90,000 crores per year. The possibility of synergy with other existing schemes, agencies, for meeting the labour needs while implementing, such as the projects of National Highways, Public Works Departments, also could be considered because, in case a State Government is not able to create jobs for them, the States will get away by paying only one-fourth of the allowance; but if we involve the labourers of these national agencies also, perhaps, they would succeed in implementing this scheme.

Also, Sir, if the corporate sector which day and night says that they are for the welfare of labourers and all that, could also contribute, at least,one per cent of their total income towards this fund, this would also be helpful. To eliminate delays in the disbursement of fund, it should also be for consideration, where the funds could be straightway given to the Panchayats rather than through the State Governments, and all that. Let the funds be given by State Governments, but not through the Project Officer or another, but they should straightway given to Panchayats.

With these suggestions, I once again support the Bill moved by the hon. Minister. Thank you.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Council of States in particular and Parliament in general is a mirror of our society.

So far as discussion on this Bill is concerned, I think, divergent views have come up in the course of whatever progress we have made in this debate. But before going into the specific issues, I would like to congratulate the Government and welcome the observations made by the hon. Minister while introducing the Bill.

This is a Bill whose future will depend not only on its passage in the two Houses of Parliament and subsequent Gazette Notification after the Presidential Assent, but the future of this Bill also depends on the cooperation of the entire House and the entire political spectrum of the political parties that constitute the polity in this country. Unfortunately, Sir, I do not know what position the Parties will ultimately take.

PROF. R.B.S. VARMA (Uttar Pradesh): It has been passed unanimously in the Lok Sabha.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Very good. It is extremely good. So, I have very, very great hopes about the future of this Act. But, I think, Sir, time has come to overcome cynicism because I can be very, very overtly bureaucratic. I mean no disrespect to Apteji. He shares my concern for over bureaucratisation of programmes in post-Independent India. But the very approach of analysing the Bill, why such a Bill cannot be implemented or why it cannot be taken forward, that tone if it overwhelms our vision, then I believe we are not really doing a great service to the future of the Bill. Therefore, first point is whether the Indian polity should collectively have a political will to implement this Bill when it becomes an Act. I do not know whether we find the consensus across the House on the question of implementation of the Act. Yes, there may be problems here and there, we will discuss, and we will also share our opinion. But the approach should be that this is something, which was not there earlier, therefore, this has to be implemented. Sir, I say this not to criticise the Opposition. But you see what was the context of this Bill. Sir, you will recall that about one-and-a-half years back an Interim Budget was presented by the NDA Government. When we were speaking from this side of the House, we pointed out that it is the question of employment which is creating a terrible situation for the rural folk in our country, and, howsoever vocal or articulate you may be about the conditions of the people and your assessment may get reflected in the slogans that you had chosen those of shining India and feeling of goodness prevailing

over the country, the fact of the matter is something totally different. We were lampooned. We were being dubbed as people who are eternal cynics and so on and so forth. Therefore, when the people spoke who are nameless, who are faceless and who are voiceless in a manner it becomes difficult for those people to digest that. Now the issue is, here is a question of political introspection that why did it happen and how can we collectively as a political system overcome this situation. I will not go into the entire situation of unemployment because not much is there. You see we were discussing the Mid-Term Appraisal yesterday and the Planning Minister replied today. Now the Mid-Term Appraisal itself says that the employment situation in the economy presents serious problem. The Mid-Term Appraisal's projections suggest that unemployment rate for the economy as a whole based on the current daily status of employment would have increased from 8.87 per cent in the base year 2001-02 to 9.11 per cent in 2004-05.

This implies that the total employment increase is slower than the labour force growth. According to the actual MTA document, if you see, Sir, the absolute number of unemployed people rose from 3.35 crores in 2001-02 to 3.63 crores in 2004-05 with employment growing at the rate of 1.1 per cent per annum against a growth of the labour force of 1.80 per cent per annum. Along with this, if you read, in the organised sector there was a net job loss of 7.89 lakhs in just three years. Apart from the question of unemployment, you look at the other basic elements of livelihood of the rural people. Now, Food and Agriculture Organisation came out with a report in the beginning of the new millennium about the state of hunger in the whole world and it was pointed out that while the population of those who were malnourished in India was in decreasing numbers in the first half of the 90s but the situation was completely reversed in the second half and 11 million more people in India went hungry. How, therefore, what is the progress? why has this happened? This has happened precisely because there is a problem in the mind-set also. The approach is not that scheme will survive because of the political will of the Central Government and the State Governments are out to sabotage this programme. If that is the approach then, I think, that this Bill has no future. In that sense, though Mr. Dhawan felt that he could effectively buttress the arguments given by Mr. Apte but the approach that was displayed here in the House, I think, is not at all positive in terms of

implementing the programmes. Now, a lot of talk has been there of what happened in the past. The basic problem of public spending in the rural areas came down. People are questioning where from money will come. I am not saying anything very, very revolutionary. You just take five heads, *i.e.* agriculture, rural development, special areas programme, irrigation and flood control and village and small scale industries. These are the five heads. In 1990-91, the expenditure for rural development was Rs. 13,500 crore. And what was it? It was four per cent of net national product. This year रघुवंश जी ने कई सरकार के बारे में बहुत सारी बातें कही हैं। इस बार इस पांच हेड के नीचे आपको कितनी ऐलोकेशन है? वही साढ़े तेरह हजार करोड़ रुपए है। अगर मैं इन्फ्लेशन की बात छोड़ दूं तो एक पैसे की भी इसमें बढ़ोतरी नहीं हुई है। इसका क्या मतलब हुआ ? जो 4% नेट नेशनल प्रोडक्ट का एक्सपेंडिचर था, इस पांच हेड के अन्दर यह घटकर 0.6% हो गया। अगर आपने इस क्षेत्र में पब्लिक स्पेन्डिग इस हद तक घटा दी। तो स्थिति क्या होगी। आप और हम लोग इस चुनाव के पहले आंध्र प्रदेश में खुदकुशी का सवाल लाए थे। आंध्र प्रदेश के किसानों की खुदकुशी का सवाल था। लेकिन एक साल में पिछली सरकार का गठन होने के बाद और आंध्र प्रदेश में नई सरकार के आने के बावजूद भी 780 किसानों ने खुदकुशी की है ...(व्यवधान)...सवाल ताली बजाने का नहीं है, सवाल यह है कि सामूहिक तौर पर हम किस तरह से इस स्थिति का सामना करेंगें।

श्री रूद्रनारायण पाणि: ताली हम आपके विरोधाभास के कारण बजाते है।

श्री सभापति: आप बैठ जाइए। आप बैठिए।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: सवाल हार जीत का नहीं है। सवाल यह है कि हम इस प्रोगाम को किस तरह लागू करेंगें, क्योंकि यह अच्छी बात है।

धवन साहब ने जो अच्छी बात कहीं उसका भी मैं जिक्र कर दूं कि उन्होनें जो संविधान की अलग-अलग धाराए यहां पर प्रस्तुत की है, that Right to work is a fundamentral Right and we have to move in that direction.That was the basic vision which inspired our freedom struggle. In that sense, this Bill is a historic Bill because this is the first Bill which not only provides a Central Scheme for employment generation but it also provides a statutroy guarantee for that. It is not a small advnce. In that sense, we have to approach the whole issue as to how we will ensure the success of this Bill. We should understand that the major problem or constraint is lack of public spending in the rural areas and unfortunately— in spite of all this talk about our

becoming the economic superpower—70 per cent of our people live in villages even now. Look at the contribution of agriculture. The contribution of agriculture to our GDP is around 25 per cent. But, population dependent on agriculture is still 70 per cent. Whereas, in 1950-51, the contribution of agriculture to our GDP was as high as 56 per cent and, at that time, the population depending on agriculture was 79 per cent. So, the question is: comparative situation and the comparative quality of life in the rural areas has, certainly, come down. Therefore, this Bill should also be construed as trying to reverse the process of under-spending in the rural areas. People ask, 'Where is the money? Unfortunately, in a backhanded way, Mr. Apte was also repeating the same arguments of the opponents of the Bill, though I am assured now, as has been told by Dr. Rambakshji, that you will also support the Bill.

सभापति जी, कल यहां Tenth Plan का जिक्र हो रहा था। सीताराम येचूरी जी कल जिक्र कर रहे थे कि 3 लाख रुपए ग्रामीण विकास के लिए हमने दसवीं योजना में रखे हैं और अब तक हम सिर्फ एक लाख करोड़ रुपए खर्च कर पाए हैं, इसमें से 87 प्रतिशत दो सालों में इन्होंने खर्च किए और 13 प्रतिशत, पिछले एक साल में नयी सरकार ने खर्च किए, इसके बाद भी हमारे पास 2 लाख करोड़ रुपए बच जाते हैं। अगर 2 लाख करोड़ रुपए हमारे पास बच जाते हैं और हमारी दसवीं योजना का जो टारगेट है, उसको हमें छूना है, तो हमको 2 साल में और 2 लाख करोड़ रुपए खर्च करने हैं। तो मुश्किल कहां पर है? पैसे की कमी कहां से है? मैं सी॰पी॰आई॰(एम॰) की ओर से कोई फिजूल चिंता की बात नहीं कह रहा हूं, यह तो मैं हमारी सरकार के Tenth Plan document का आंकड़ा दे रहा हूं। जब गरीब के सवाल पर, रोजगार के सवाल पर कुछ कदम उठाए जाते हैं, तो ये सब डाक्यूमेंट बताने वाले लोग हमारे वामपंथियों पर हमला बोलते हैं। हम समझ नहीं पा रहे है कि पैसा क्यों नहीं है। अगर आप ज्यादा कुछ नहीं भी करते, तो 1990-1991 में जो फिगर थी, Net National Product का 4 परसेंट अगर इन 5 heads पर खर्च करते, तो आपके पास पैसे की कोई कमी नहीं है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि this is a very, very important legislation.I am sorry people are asking questions about why all these consultations could not take place. Along with the hon. Minister, I would also like to congratulate the hon. Chairman of the Standing Committee and all the Members of the Standing Committee for submitting to Parliament such an excellent Report. Now, the whole process and the work that has been done by the Standing Committee is commendable. In fact, the Standing Committee ensured a lot of discussion. And, if majority of those recommendations are incorporated now in the Bill, I think, we

should not only compliment the Government alone for this Bill, but also all those people who have contributed to the national debate and discourse on the Bill in the intervening period.

Therefore, what we find today is a completely different Bill from what we had introduced earlier in the other House. And, that is how this Bill has to be seen. In the process of an emerging consensus, I think, this is an issue on which we cannot, cannot divide the polity along political lines. The issue, today, is to mobilise the entire public opinion because apart from other things—yes, bureaucracy may be an issue; how to overcome bureaucracy—Panchayats will have to be activated, Gram Sabhas will have to be activated. How can we bring in more transparency? Now, we have also passed another historic Bill, that is, the Right to Information Bill. It provides for opening up muster rolls of our people who are going to work. The creation of registration for households as to how we can utilize new technologies there. And, most importantly, how we can sensitise, develop and generate awareness across the country. Can one single party or the Government do it? It is our responsibility, our entire responsibility. And, in that light we have to see it. And. in that sense, I think, nobody should premise that only the Central Government is trying to do this and the State Governments are trying to divert, and not to spend, and so on and so forth. I think, that kind of approach is totally counterproductive. We had also made our humble contribution is this. For example, we tried to bring forward several provisions, which were not there, when we intracted with the Government that this switch off, switch on, this lack of commitment to extend it to the whole of the country in a certain time bound period. The universal nature that you cannot distinguish between the APL and the BPL, because anybody looking for employment must be provided with an opportunity for employment. The role of panchayats, the expansion of the definition of what, will it only be an earthwork? On the one hand, that provision was also served through our interaction with the Government that there must be some direction towards reserving one-third of the beneficiaries to women. Now, if women are going to work, what kind of work will they get? Will it be only manual earthwork? Or, even we can use this Employment Guarantee Bill or guarantee scheme for creating jobs in the social sector; or, the overall improvement in the quality of life in the rural areas, both, physical and social infrastructrue this can be utilized. So, I think, everybody is making

a contribution. and, we have no problem, we would be happier, if this Bill would provide employment for 100 per cent of those who are not having employment. But the choice was between having such an ideal situation and not having a Bill and we make a progress, and if all of us work and if we actually bring out certain tangible achievements, which will inspire our people, and, then, they can also be further mobilised for expanding the scope of the scheme that we have here. Because I do not believe there are many economists in our country who think that this is a wasteful expenditure. And, I totally share the sentiments of the hon. Minister that, Sir, actually if we analyse the economic situation in the country, there has been a major demand constraint. There was some figure that already, in the last six months, the demand for diesel has come down. So, it is not that we are in a situation where there is a demand for the kind of industrial production.

So, we have to financially and economically, empower the people. Yes, India can become an economic powerhouse provided we have an inclusive economy where the vast majority of the people who are unemployed can also be empowered to the extent to become purchasers of the kind of products that we produce in our factories. Therefore, Sir, I think, this Bill is a Bill which is sound economics, and very correct, contemporary politics because we have seen what happens if we cannot empower the people. Therefore, I think, the resolve here should be, in the coming days, how all of us can work together to implement the Bill. If we are passing the Bill unanimously, in its implementation also that approach should be reflected. We need not fear if we are sincere about sensitising the people, if we are sincere in mobilizing the people and, definitely, the provisions of this Act can be implemented and it will create wealth and it will also distribute, perhaps, in a more egalitarian manner, happiness in this country. Sir, I overshot time. You kindly permitted me, I thank you, and conclude.

DR. BIMAL JALAN (Nominated): Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. I will not take very long. As has been pointed out here, it is, certainly, one of the most important pieces of legislation in the post-Independence India. This is a historic Bill.

[THE VICE CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIAN) in the Chair]

We have heard that if it succeeds, and, I believe, that if it is correctly assessed, then, in about 7 to 8 years, India will not have more than ten

per cent people below the poverty line. So, it is historic. It is very good and I welcome it. If we are keen in doing what you say, we will do it. We have heard the distinguished Rural Development Minister, who is a great leader, a great orator, and a great thinker, and I share what he has put forward in terms of the benefits of the Bill. I wish him luck in implementing it. I just want to, Sir, with your permission, make three positive and constructive suggestions for his consideration. The Bill has been discussed widely. It is good that for the last eight months it has been discussed in the public, it has been discussed in the Standing Committee, and it has now been discussed in the Lok Sabha. All though it may have to be hastily rushed through in this House, it does not matter because, I think, most of the positives and negatives and most of the issues have now been raised and resolved. The Government has finally come to a decision with the help of the left parties. I think some of the improvements that have been made are welcome, particularly, the removal of poor households and making it applicable to all households. Also, the enunciation of a minimum wage of Rs. 60 across the country is there. The point about that is that it is not a question of policy, but it would reduce the bureaucratic hurdles in the way of implementing the Bill. So I welcome those two major improvements along with any other improvements which have been made.

The constructive suggestion that I want to make is this. I request the hon. Minister, and through him, the Government that just as he has so eloquently argued in favour of it, one year from now, that is, on 24th August, 2006, we should have a report from him in this House as to what has been accomplished, what problems have arisen, how they have been resolved, how much employment has been created, and how many jobs have been acquired. Let us give him one year of goodwill. I agree with Mr. Nilotpal Basu that all of us should, collectively, now, at this stage, work together to make it a success because if it is a success, then, it will be the most important post-Independence achievement in our country. But,I would like him to assure in his reply that on 24th August, 2006 he will come back to his House and tell us how it has been done. I would also like to suggest to him that the best way of doing it, perhaps, for the Government would be to have a Minister; a Minister of State in his Ministry, exclusively, responsible for monitoring the implementation of this Act

because it is a historic Act, it is a sweeping Act and a widespread Act. One Minister of State, exclusively, should be there. He can be taken from any other Ministry or his own Minister of State should have the exclusive responsibility to monitor and to resolve problems and to make it a success...

And, to tell us, one year from now, what problems have been faced, how many jobs have been created and what has been done. Then , that particular person should be held responsible. I have heard a lot of discussion here around the Table as to involving the people at different levels. Obviously, you have to involve the people at different levels, but, ultimately, what do you mean by creating a job in a village. The creation of a job in a village means identification of a scheme, getting the materials together, identification of a person providing him with a wage, so on and so forth. There is a lot of book keeping, and a lot of things which have to be done, just as in doing anything on the ground. What I find is, the way you have defined now the administrative structure, that there are cross-cutting responsilities. I don't agree with Shri Bal Apte that there is one bureaucrat who is responsible for implementing it. One bureaucrat, it might be said in this Bill, is responsible, but there are 20 agencies. You have State-level agencies, both a council as well as a fund, you have a Central-level agency, you have a District-level agency, you have block-level agency, and you have village-level agency. Now, it is not that horizontally and vertically, we shouldn't have 20 peope involved. We should have 20 people involved. The problem in our system is that these 20 agencies are not responsible to each other. Whenever there is a discussion on power, we hear that it is a concurrent subject. We are first to announce the target that we will create 37,000 megawatts or whatever it is, but when it is not done, the Minister would rise and tell you that it is a concurrent subject, what can I do? If there is a discussion on poverty alleviation, you would say some district panchayat hasn't done what it was supposed to. If you ask the district panchayat, it would say " I haven't got the money which the Ministry of Finance is supposed to give me." If you ask the State Government, they would say, "the Central Government has not given me the money." so this buck-passing is a normal feature of our system. I hope it doesn't happen.

So my first suggestion to the hon. Minister is that please appoint one Minister who is responsible — or through him, to the Government, because

he doesn't appoint Ministers-- and come back and tell us what exactly has been accomplished on the ground. I have made some suggestions. I have written to him, and all the other leaders also that the way it is envisaged now, it is not likely to work. But if it doesn't work, it is not that we give up. Let us substitute it with something else in terms of administrative structure. I think, it can be done and we should try and do it.

So, this is the first point that I would like to highlight. I hope the Minister would agree and give an assurance here that on 24th August, 2006. I will come and tell us what he has been able to do and what he has not. If he has not been able to do, it is not that this is a failure. It is that I mean to do something different. And that is it. In 2007, we can examine if, because we have five years to implement it successfully.

Sir, the second point is on the economic side. We have heard a lot here on the fiscal, economics, etc. I just apprise you that I don't think that the financial aspect is the most important aspect. That is the second level aspect. When all is said and done, over a period of time there would be pressure on the Budget, whether it is 30,000, 40,000 or 20,000, 60,000. That does't matter. But there would be a pressure on the Budget. And the most important thing at that point of time which I would urge the Minister, and, through him, the Government and the Finance Minister is that if we have to make economies anywhere, these economies must not be made in areas which are of interest for poverty alleviation. 'Education for All', 'Health for All', Irrigation, Public Investment, Water, we must protect these poverty alleviation schemes. And, this again, must be an assurance from the Government every year that if there is a stress on the Budget, we are cutting something else, but not on the poverty alleviation schemes, because those poverty alleviation schemes are the final answer, are the ultimate answer. The employment guarantee is an interim solution to a problem which we are facing. So, this is the second related problem. But let us not worry about the money, let us implement it and then make sure that if there is a pressure on the Budget, we sacrifice or the cost of it is not borne by the real poverty alleviation schemes which provide sustainable employment and sustainable output in the long run. Sir, this is the second related point.

The third and the final point, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, which is slightly economic is that I would suggest to the Finance Minister, or, rather through the Rural Development Minister to the Finance Minister that when the stress is developed, or whenever it happens, let us not get into new taxes,

4.00 P.M.

new cesses, and so on. Let us do it transparently, directly, because we have a highly complex tax system. You have introduced two, three new taxes. We keep on introducing new cesses. They don't accomplish what we say they would do.

So, if we need money, let us raise it directly, by increasing the rates of existing five, six, seven taxes, rather than introducing a new cess; find the money, put it in your account, not use it, and say that we have excess and then transfer it elsewhere. So, let us not complicate the tax system. This may be a technical point, but it is an important point, I believe.

So, Sir, these three points, I would says for your consideration that we should insist on. Let us not worry about the money; let us worry about implementation; let us not worry about how the jonbs are going to be created. Let us worry about whether we are able to create the jobs, and let us not increase complexity or let us not reduce the budget for other poverty alleviation schemes because we are under fiscal stress.

Thank you.

श्री कमाल अख्तर (उत्तर प्रदेश) उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपका धन्यवाद। मैं समाजवादी पार्टी की तरफ से रोज़गार गारंटी विधेयक पर बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूँ। शायद ही कोई ऐसा व्यक्ति होगा, जो इस विधेयक का विरोध करेगा।

महोदय, यह बात सही है कि देश की तरक्की का रास्ता गाँवों से होकर गुजरता है। मैं सरकार को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि करीब 50 वर्षों के बाद उसे यह बात समझ में आई कि गाँवों के विकास से ही देश का विकास होगा। सारा सदन जानता है कि इस देश में 58 सालों में 50 साल तक किन लोगों ने शासन किया और गरीबी, बेरोज़गारी तथा गाँवों के विकास की यह बात, जो आज उठाई जा रही है, अगर उस समय उठाई गई होती, तो आज यह देश निश्चित तौर पर बहुत आगे हो गया होता।

हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री जी ने 15 अगस्त को लाल किले से कहा कि हमारे देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था हर वर्ष 7 फीसदी की दर से बढ़ रही है। लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, देश के अंदर गरीबी और बेरोज़गारी बढ़ने का प्रतिशत सन् 2001 से 2003 तक 8.87 है और 2004 से 2005 तक बेरोज़गारी और बेकारी बढ़ने का प्रतिशत 9.11 है। इससे यह बात साफ हो जाती है कि 7 प्रतिशत की जिस तरक्की से अर्थ व्यवस्था बढ़ रही है, उससे ज्यादा तरक्की के साथ बेरोज़गारी और बेकारी आज देश के अन्दर बढ़ रही है। सिर्फ गरीबी हटाने के नारों के साथ गरीबी और बेरोज़गारी

को नहीं हटाया जा सकता है अगर हर हाथ को काम मिल जाए, लोगों को रोज़गार मिल जाए, तो घर के अन्दर खुशियाँ आ जाती हैं और गरीबी किस चीज का नाम है? गरीबी किसी चीज़ का नाम नहीं है। गरीबी नाम है-बेरोगज़गारी का। अगर लोगों को काम मिल जाए, अगर लोगों को रोजगार का कोई साधन मिल जाए, तो निश्चित तौर पर खुशहाली आ जाती है और गरीबी और बेकारी अपने आप दूर हो जाती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह एक महत्वपूर्ण बिल आया है, लेकिन इसे महत्वपूर्ण और प्रभावी बनाने में इसमें कुछ कमियाँ हैं, जिन्हें दूर किया जाना चाहिए। महोदय, इससे पहले भी सरकार ने बहुत-सी रोज़गार-सृजन की योजनाएँ चलाई हैं, जिनमें जवाहर रोज़गार योजना, एम्प्लायमेंट एश्योरेंस स्कीम, जवाहर ग्रामीण समृद्धि योजना, जवाहर सुनिश्चित रोज़गार योजना, सम्पूर्ण ग्रामीण रोज़गार योजना, ये सारी-की-सारी योजनाएँ सरकार ने चलाई हैं। लेकिन मैं सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ये सारी-सारी योजनाएँ या तो करप्शन की वजह से या भ्रष्टाचार की वज़ह से या बहुत-से ऐसे ही कारणों से फेल हो गईं । यह स्कीम लाने से पहले हम लोगों को चाहिए थी कि ये सारी योजनाएं, जो रोज़गार सृजन के लिए सरकार ने लाई थीं, इन योजनाओं के फेल होने की आखिर क्या वजह थी, क्या हालात थे कि इतनी महत्वपूर्ण योजनाएँ, जो गरीबों के लिए बनाई गई थी, वे फेल हो गईं। अगर इसकी समीक्षा की जाती, इसके ऊपर गहन अध्ययन किया जाता, तो निश्चित तौर पर यह जो महत्वपूर्ण बिल आया है, इसकी कामयाबी के लिए वह एक अहम पहलू होता और इस बिल की कामयाबी की गारंटी होता।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, रोज़गार गारंटी का मतलब होता है- उस आदमी को रोज़गार मिलना, जो बेरोज़गार है।

महोदय, भारत के अंदर संयुक्त परिवार की परम्परा है और इस बिल के अंदर परिवार के एक ही सदस्य को रोज़गार देने की बात कही गई है और न्यूनतम मज़दूरी 60 रुपये निर्धारित की गई है। यहां पर माननीय श्री जय राम रमेश जी भी बैठे हैं जो कि एक बहुत बड़े अर्थशास्त्री हैं, मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि जहां पर हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर संयुक्त परिवार की परम्परा है, अगर कोई भी आदमी, एक बड़े परिवार का मुखिया 60 रुपये पर मजदूरी करता है तो एक महीने के अन्दर वह 500 रुपया महीना कमाएगा और पूरे साल के अन्दर 6000 रुपये कमाएगा, इतने कम रुपयों के अन्दर वह एक इतने बड़े परिवार को कैसे पाल सकता है? आज कोई भी आदमी अपने बच्चों को अच्छी शिक्षा, अपने परिवार के लिए अच्छे कपड़े, पूरे परिवार के लिए दवाई अथवा बेटी की शादी, ऐसा कौन सा कार्य केवल 60 रुपये प्रतिदिन की कमाई से कर सकता है, यह मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं? किन्तु समिति की एक रिपोर्ट के अंदर यह लिखा गया था कि इस योजना के अन्दर यह संभाव्य रूप से लागू होना चाहिए। मैं चाहता हूं कि परिवार के एक सदस्य के

बजाए, परिवार के अन्दर जिनते भी सक्षम लोग हैं, उन सभी को इस योजना के अंतर्गत 100 दिन का रोज़गार मिलना चाहिए, जिससे इस योजना का अधिक से अधिक लाभ प्राप्त हो सके। जहां तक 60 रुपये न्यूनतम मज़दूरी तय किए जाने का सवाल है, हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर ऐसे कई राज्य हैं जहां पर आज भी 60 रुपये से अधिक मज़दूरी मिल रही है, इसलिए हम लोगों के हिसाब से यह रकम बहुत कम है और इसे बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए।

महोदय, विधेयक में यह कहा गया है कि इसे केवल 200 जनपदों के अन्दर ही लागू किया जाएगा, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से विनम्रतापूर्वक यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि बाकी के 400 जनपदों के गरीबों और बेरोज़गारों का क्या होगा? क्या इस देश के अन्दर यह उन 400 जनपदों के गरीब लोगों के साथ अन्याय नहीं होगा, जहां पर इस योजना को लागू नहीं किया गया है। मैं आपसे यह भी पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस कार्यक्रम को लागू करने के लिए, इस योजना को लागू करने के लिए एक प्रोग्राम अधिकारी नियुक्त किया गया है,यहां पर मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूं कि नौकरशाहों के चंगुल में जो भी योजनाएं अथवा स्कीमें रही हैं, उनका हाल अवश्य ही बुरा हुआ है। इसलिए मेरा आपसे यह अनुरोध है कि इसे नौकरशाहों के चंगुल से मुक्त करके ग्राम समाज एवं गांव के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों पर छोड़ दिया जाए, इसके लिए आपको इसका अधिकार ग्राम सभाओं को देना पड़ेगा। आपने इसमें यह भी कहा है कि यदि इस स्कीम में कहीं पर भी भ्रष्टाचार पाया गया तो इस स्कीम को धन देना बंद कर दिया जाएगा, यह उन गरीबों के साथ अन्याय होगा। इसके स्थान पर आपको इसमें इस प्रकार का प्रावधान करना चाहिए कि जहां पर भी भ्रष्टाचार होगा, उन लोगों के खिलाफ़ सख्त कार्यवाही की जाएगी। भ्रष्टाचार को रोकने के लिए आपके द्वारा यह प्रावधान किया जाए, न कि इस योजना के लिए धन रोकने का प्रावधान किया जाए अगर आप इस योजना को ईमानदारी के साथ लागू करना चाहते हैं तो मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह योजना केन्द्र सरकार की है, इसलिए पूरे का पूरा व्यय भार केन्द्र सरकार को ही उठाना चाहिए, जबकि आपने 10 प्रतिशत के व्यय भार को राज्य सरकारों पर ही छोड़ दिया हैं । आप जानते हैं कि बहुत सी राज्य सरकारों की माली हालत बहुत खराब है, उनकी माली स्थिति के बारे में सरकार बहुत अच्छी तरह से जानती हैं कि आज उनके पास अपने अधिकारियों एवं कर्मचारियों को देने तक के लिए वेतन भी नहीं है। इसलिए मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि इस योजना को क्रियान्वित करने के लिए राज्यों सरकारों पर जो 10 प्रतिशत का व्यय भार है, उससे उन्हें मुक्त किया जाए, तभी इस योजना को पूरा लाभ मिल सकेगा।

दूसरा, इस स्कीम के अन्तर्गत एक जगह यह भी कहा गया है कि गांवों में इसे 50 व्यक्तियों से चालू किया जाएगा। बहुत से गांवों के अन्दर ऐसे काम भी होते हैं जिस काम को केवल 10 व्यक्ति भी कर सकते हैं। यदि किसी स्थान पर 50 व्यक्ति नहीं होंगे तब क्या इस स्कीम को लागू नहीं किया जाएगा? क्या लोगों को काम प्राप्त नहीं होगा? इसलिए इसे और अधिक लचीला

बनाए जाने की जरूरत है, इसमें 10 लोगों से काम करवाने की योजना के लिए प्रावधान किया जाना चाहिए।

महोदय, अंत में मैं एक और बात कह कर अपनी बात को समाप्त करूंगा कि यहां पर ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की गरीबी और बेरोज़गारी को दूर करने की बात चल रही है, लेकिन देश में शहरी क्षेत्र भी हैं और उन शहरी क्षेत्रों में भी करोड़ों ग़रीब और बेरोज़गार लोग रहते हैं, इसके लिए सरकार को शहरी क्षेत्रों के लिए भी ऐसा एक विधेयक लाना चाहिए था, जिससे वहां के लोगों की ग़रीबी और बेरोज़गारी को दूर किया जा सके। अगर यहां पर शहरों के लिए "शहरी रोज़गार गारंटी विधेयक" नहीं आया तो निश्चित तौर पर यह शहरों में रहने वाले ग़रीबों और बेरोज़गारों के साथ अन्याय होगा। मैं जानता हूं कि आज यहां "ग्रामीण रोज़गार गारंटी विधेयक" पर चर्चा की जा रही है, लेकिन इस चर्चा के साथ-साथ हम लोगों को देश के शहरी क्षेत्रों की उपेक्षा भी नहीं करनी चाहिए और होना तो यह चाहिए था कि इसी विधेयक के आगे या पीछे "शहरी रोज़गार गारंटी योजना" को भी लगा दिया जाता ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please conclude, Mr. Akhtar.

श्री कमाल अख्तर: इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, आपका इस बात के लिए धन्यवाद करते हुए कि आपने मुझे इस विधेयक पर बोलने के लिए समय दिया, मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन, इस उम्मीद के साथ करता हूं कि इसके लागू होने से ग़रीबी एवं बेरोज़गारी दूर होगी। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF P.J. KURIAN): Shri Arjun Sengupta. Is it your maiden speech?

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Yes, it is my maiden speech. I feel very proud that I am speaking on this very historic occasion after a truly historic Bill has been approved by the Lok Sabha. There are two major reasons why this Bill is historic. One is—I think that the point has been made by Shri Nilotpal Basu and also earlier by my friend, Dr. Bimal Jalan that this is really a consensus Bill. After the Standing Committee's deliberations, the original Bill has changed so substantially that it is very difficult for anybody to say that all the experiences of the previous programmes have not been considered and taken into account. A very clear example of that was the role of the Panchayats. Shri Dhawan pointed it out how the original emphasis of the Programme Officer got changed into monitoring, implementation and also programme design by the Panchayats. These are all results of discussion that took place,

and I think, it is a truly historic Bill in that sense of a consensus. The second reason why it is a historic Bill, and this is what I beg to submit to you, is that this really means a paradigm shift of economic policy. We are not fully appreciating the implication of that. It is, of course, a Bill which is guaranteeing unemployment insurance which most industrial countries have in its direct form or direct transfer of 100 days work. I think after this, suicide by firmers, etc., will become history. It would be available to everybody and everywhere. Secondly, it will remove or reduce poverty very significantly. There are calculations which show that if only the poor get the benefit of this, poverty would have come down by about 40 per cent. But I am not saying that only the poor will take advantage of this . In our country, 75 per cent of our people live below 2 dollars a days, which is a universal definition of the poverty line. So, most of our people are poor. If even somebody above the Indian poverty line which is even less than one dollar, can take advantage of this, it will make a definite impact on poverty. The third, and I think, the most important provision is that this is the first time a right to work has been recognised. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir the language of right has to be fully appreciated. It is not just a rhetoric. The American Declaration of Independence said that we, the people of the United States, give us this Constitution as our right, and if a Government fails to implement that right, we have the right to overthrow that Government. The right is a very powerful instrument that is given to the people. We are now riding a tiger. If we cannot ride it properly, we shall be devoured by the tiger. I think that this is a consensus Bill, and all of us should have taken care of this. We must realise our responsibility to see that we do deliver. In order to do that, I will just make three points. First is the question of cost. Now, there are different estimates of the cost. In fact, most of the cost estimates have not taken into account what economists call supply responses. People do not go for job just because the salary is available. But estimates have been made and that estimates show that—even if it is universal when anybody who is willing to work should get a job—the total expenditure would be about 2 per cent of the GDP. This is on the basis of their reservation wage, as we call, casual workers' wage, etc., compared to different levels of market wages.

But, we do not say that; we say "only people who are really needy", as it happened in many places. The Standing Committee talks about 25 per cent people, 50 per cent people. Then, the actual amount may be 1.2-1.3

per cent of GDP. Nevertheless, the total amount would be quite substantial,. Let us not fool ourselves that it will be a very small amount. Thirty-five thousand to fifty thousand crores of rupees is the bill that we should actually think of, and if it extends to the urban sector, we should be prepared to have another Rs. Ten thousand crores. We may not be able to provide it immediately. It has to be done step by step as it has been proposed in the Bill and that we should be prepared to provide for that . Now, it is true that for seven per cent rate of growth of GDP, this is not much. Two per cent is less than one- third of the incremental income. But, it is not true of the Budget. For the Budget, it is a very large provision. We have to frame the Budget completely differently. We have to consider measures affecting both revenues and expenditures. Mr. Jalan pointed out that certain type of expenditures should not be cut. He is very correct. You cannot cut expenditure on poverty alleviation if you are talking about Employment Guarantee Scheme. Then, you should be prepared to adjust your expenditure otherwise, you should also be prepared to think about taxes, to think of different ways of raising money. I am quite sure the hon. Finance Minister would be able to do that because he knows his arithmetic very well. But, it would imply a change of the Budget- making, a change of the Budget making, because this is something which cannot be provided by foreign aid or investment. You cannot get foreign aid and directly meet the requirement because we have to change it into rupees, and if we have to change it into rupees, you have to import which is very difficult in these circumstances. A new approach to financial management is implied in this particular Bill. The second thing is new approach to planning.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please, be brief.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: Sir, I want to make two points. The point which was mentioned by Shri Apte was very correct. You have to consider about what is in the future, and that is planning. You have to now talk about schemes in the rural areas, and how they are coordinated with each other, how they are balanced with each other in terms of inputs and outputs. This is not the plan that we have been following. It is the ground level planning starting from below. It is no longer a planning with just a macro-model, worked out at the centre. And, third is the decentralisation and I must say that this is the first time that Panchayats have been fully involved. Unfortunately, I cannot say that tall Panchayats will be able to do this job. They have to be taken through this process. A

new movement will have to be worked out so that the Panchayats are actually empowered. These three new policy paradigm changes are implied in this Bill and if the Government do not do it following this Bill, it will not be able to deliver and if the Government doesn't deliver, making people conscious of the rights is a very dangerous thing. You will be devoured by the tiger.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Thank you, Mr. Sengupta, for your maiden speech. Now, Shri N. Jothi.

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu): Thank you very much, Sir. Much has been said about this Bill. Lot of discussions have taken place. Mr. Raghuvansh Prasad may not be knowing who I am. But, I am his admirer. Yes, I am his admirer. The reason is this—he comes from a very humble background, and I also come from a very humble background. Sir, we are now talking about some guarantee in employment and some solace to be paid to them, minimum work to be given or minimum payment to be given. We are not talking of that. Our comrades have put in their might in the matter. I thank them for that. Sir, while achieving this object, what is now sought to be done is burdening the State Government. Kindly appreciate this particular problem.

Sir, one-fourth of the expenditure is sought to be put on the shoulders of the poor State Governments. The State Governments are already reeling under financial crunch. Deficit budgets are well known to the State Governments. Successive Finance Commission have been there. For example, in the State of Tamil Nadu from where I got elected, we are facing the problem with the Finance Commission also. They are not disbursing the payment in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. That is our grievance. Suddenly, a novel attempt has been made to bifurcate advanced States, the States which are affluent and poor States. Such a demarcation is not there in the Constitution, but now suddenly it has been found out. Moneys have not been properly given. Central revenue netted from the State Government is not shared with the State Government. Now, Sir, you are identifying certain Districts in the villages or in the States, and, one-fourth of the problem is added due to the advertisements, regular advertisements both in vernacular and English to be made by the State Governments.

While introducing the VAT scheme, the Finance Minister said that we would share the burden for an initial period. Like that, I appeal to the hon.

Minister to please bear the full extent of the burden by yourself for a period of three years or five years. Don't push it on to the shoulders of the State Governments. We are going to gave an experimental measure initially. Any good scheme will have and experimental measure. So, for the first given period, which according to me should be, at least, three years, the full burden should be taken over by the Central Government itself and should not to be passed on the State Governments.

Sir, on this day, I would like to appeal to all the Members of the Treasury Benches as well as the Opposition, including respectful Chair. Sir, we are now talking of the rural employment, to alleviate poverty, to give employment, at least, for 100 days, to give minimum wages, etc. Sir, with folded hands, I appeal to all of you to see what we are now and what is the surrounding situation around us.

Sir, I am having an authenticated document. Kindly don't under-estimate me that I am talking something in the air. I am having the documentation with me. I am ready to authenticate it with full responsibility. I am ready to face the consequences. We are now talking about the minimum wages to be given to the poorest of the poor whereas*

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Why are you levelling charges?

SHRI N. JOTHI: Yes, Sir. I am not levelling charges. I am having authenticated documents with me. (*Interruptions*) Yes, Sir, I am now quoting it from record that the *(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, what is the relevance of this?.. (*Interruptions*) this is absolutely not..(*Interruptions*)..

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I am having the record. (*Interruptions*)

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, this way, a Member cannot level a charge...(*Interruptions*)

श्री कलराज मिश्र (उत्तरप्रदेश): महोदय ...(व्यवधान)..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Jothi ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jothi, please... (*Interruptions*)

---

*Not recorded.

SHRI N. JOTHI: I am having the record. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री रूद्रनारायण पाणि: आप दिखा दीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN) Mr. Jothi ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jothi, please ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, this is not the procedure... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Jothi, have you taken the permission earlier to present this paper here. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I am now...(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN):No, no. Listen, listen to me. *(Interruptions)* You please speak on the subject. (*Interruptions*) No, you please speak on the subject.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, he is having documents? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI N. JOTHI: Yes, Sir, I am having documents to show ...(*Interruptions*)... Why are you afraid of this document? ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please sit down. (*Interruptions*) Please sit down. Mr. Jothi, you please sit down. Please, please. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jothi, if you want to make an allegation against any Member, there is a procedure. You please follow that procedure.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, it is not an allegation; it is a statement. (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): No, you cannot do that. (*Interruptions*).. No, no. You cannot do that ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI) : Sir, it is definitely an allegation ...(*Interruptions*)... He can not make an allegation ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN):There is a Point of Order. Please sit down, Mr. Jothi ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Sir, please expunge this portion from the proceeding ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN):Please, sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jothi, please sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Narayanasamy is on a Point of Order. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, under Rule 238A, when an hon. Member is making an allegation against a member or a Minister, he should give a notice in advance and an explanation should be sought from the Minister concerned. Thereafter, he has got a right of explanation. Then only, the allegation can be made. He cannot offend...*(Interruptions)*.. There is a set procedure in the House. ..*(Interruptions)*.. I want your ruling on this, Sir. He cannot make an allegation. ...(*Interruptions*)..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Prof. P.J.Kurian) : Please, please, sit down. ...(*Interruptions*).. please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, this is not ...(*Interruptions*)... It is a statement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me answer him. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. I will listen to you. ...*(Interruptions)*... You please don't ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Jothi, go to your seat. Please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Ahluwalia, please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will decide. ...*(Interruptions)*... You won't decide ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I have a point of order. ...(*Interruptions*)...

The VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): No, No, let me answer him first ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: I am supporting him, Sir, (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Ahluwalia, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Pany, please sit down. I do not need your support. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: I would answer him, Sir ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): You need not answer. He is on a Point of Order. I have to answer him. You need not answer. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, let me answer him. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am a lawyer and I can answer. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): No, no for a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am on my legs. Please, sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please, sit down. I am asking you to sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... You see, here is a point of order raised by an hon. Member. It is the duty of the Chair to respond to that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Point of order against whom? ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Keep quite. It is my job ...*(Interruptions)*... You can't do that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: First you hear him. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): I have to deal with the point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, natural justice should be given. I should be heard before your ruling. ...*(Interruptions)*... I should be heard before your ruling. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Which rule says that without hearing the Member. ...*(Interruptions)*... Which rule says ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Sit down. Please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me deal with the point or order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Which rule says that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): You listen to me. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will hear you. ...*(Interruptions)*... I know that. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will control that. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will decide. Are you to decide? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: The House will decide. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Ahluwalia Please, take your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*... please, take your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir I should be hear. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): All of you, please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, take your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, before you give you ruling, I should be given a chance. Please, hear me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): I will give you a chance. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, who will decide. ...(*Interruptions*)... Which rule says. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Ahluwalia, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Ahluwalia, don't control the house sitting there. ...(*Interruptions*)... You can come here and control. ...(*Interruptions*)... If Mr. Ahluwalia wants to come here. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Let me be heard, please. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is what I am saying ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Narayanasamy raised a point of order under Rule 238A. Let me read what it says. "No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any other member or a member of the House unless the member making the allegation has given previous intimation to the Chairman and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply." Have you done that? Now, you can speak.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Yes, Sir.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: It is not defamatory. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Ahluwalia, this is unbecoming of a Member. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Narayanasamy, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... What is your reply.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I am thankful to you for having given me the opportunity to respond. I am also thankful for the natural justice given by you. Now, I am answering to that. Let us read that section. I will brief the

hon. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Sir, while participating in the debate on the National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will go through all these papers and decide myself.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Yes, Sir. I have said that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, come to the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Now, I am coming to the point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't raise that matter again. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: The Hon. Member, Shri Narayanasamy, raised a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who was speaking?

SHRI N. JOTHI: Hon. Chairman, Sir, while participating in the debate, I have said that we are crying for rural unemployment to be eradicated and a solatium to be paid to them. What is our position?*...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow that. ...*(Interruptions)*... It will not go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*... It will not go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, come to the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*... If you want to finish it, then finish. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Please, hear me, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will not go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, it is relevant. I will tell you how. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any allegation without. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Please, hear me and then decide it yourself. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have decided it. It will not go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Please, hear me, Sir. I am having a judgement of income tax report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: First give me a copy of it.

---

*Not recorded.

SHRI N. JOTHI: I am giving you, Sir. Please, have it, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me see it. ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Why are they afraid of the truth? ...*(Interruptions)*... Are you afraid of the truth? ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: Just two minutes before my distinguished colleague, Mr. V. Narayanasamy, raised the same issue. ...*(Interruptions)*... First, dispose that of. ...*(Interruptions)*... So long as a ruling is pending before the Chair raised by a Member, until it is disposed of, further proceedings ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Mr. Dasmunsi, Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, it is my appeal to you.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Mr. Dasmunsi, Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: I know the rules of both Houses of Parliament. I was also a Chief Whip like Mr. S.S. Ahluwalia. ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, the truth is far better than. ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jothi, under Rule 238, before speaking anything. ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I will repeat it. ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I will not allow you. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will not allow you to repeat it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Please, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: Sir, the fact is. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It may be a fact, but first you should have taken a prior permission from me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: The Minister should also be available. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: It is for your convenience. ...*(Interruptions)*... Hon. Chairman, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You come to the subject.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, this is an Income Tax Report. ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It may be an Income Tax Report, but you should have shown it first to me. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: I have given it to you, Sir. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not sure about it. I have to go through it. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, what is the ruling on my point of order? *(Interruptions)*.

SHRIMATI S.G. INDIRA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, he is not making any allegations. *(Interruptions)*. He is giving an information. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow any allegation to go on record. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, at page 407, the name of the ..*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow that. *(Interruptions)*. I am not going to allow it. *(Interruptions)*. Please, take your seat. *(Interruptions)*. Nothing will go on record. *(Interruptions)*. Nothing will go on record. *(Interruptions)*. Please, take your seat. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, we are talking about rural unemployment. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow any allegation to be made without my prior permission. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, I am not making any allegation. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI:*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow you ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing will go on record ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat ...*(Interruptions)*... I will not allow any allegation without my permission ...*(Interruptions)*... No, no ...*(Interruptions)*... Please start the debate ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing

---

*Not recorded.

will go on record ...*(Interruptions)*... I will not allow you ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing will go on record ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Jothi, come to your point ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: *

श्री सभापति: मैं एलाउ नहीं कर रहा हूं ...(व्यवधान)... Nothing will go on record ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing will go on record against any Member or this House without my permission ...*(Interruptions)*... Now, your time is over ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia, please take your seat ...*(Interruptions)*... I will not allow you to speak unless you give me all the papers beforehand in writing ...*(Interruptions)*... Shrimati Vanga Geetha ...*(Interruptions)*... Now, your time is over ...*(Interruptions)*... Shrimati Vanga Geetha ...*(Interruptions)*.... I will see the papers and if there is need, I will collect the papers...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir, respecting you, with folded hands, I request you to render justice in the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rest assure, I will do justice. Shrimati Vanga Geetha.

SHRIMATI VANGA GEETHA (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to express my views on the National Rural Employment Guarantee Bill, 2005, as passed by Lok Sabha. I participate in this debate on behalf of my party and on my own behalf. Sir, the present UPA Government has announced their National Common Minimum Programme as a post-poll assurance to the people. Sir, many parties have contested against each other during the last elections. As no alliance got absolute majority, the present arrangement of UPA is under compulsion and to overcome the criticism of coming together for sharing power. They have come out with a National Common Minimum Programme, Sir, in which, they have promised to the people that they will provide legal employment to the people for, at least, 100 days in a year and if they fail to do so, the applicant will be paid compensation. Sir, they have also assured that they will bring the Bill immediately and will cover the whole

*Not recorded.

country. Sir, now, the Bill says, it will be implemented in about 200 districts only, out of around 600 districts in the country. Sir, the estimated expenditure, according to the Government, will be around Rs. 40,000 crore in a year. For these 200 districts also, there are a lot of ambiguities in the Bill. Sir, the term 'legal employment' needs further explanation. If a person in a rural village is not only poor, but also illiterate, how can we expect him to take legal remedy?

I request the hon. Minister to clarify this aspect. Now, I come to Chapter-III of the Bill, that is, Employment Guarantee Scheme and Unemployment Allowance. If work is provided for only 100 days in a year, what will happen in the rest of the year? If a minimum wage of about Rs. 60/- is calculated for 100 days, it comes to Rs. 6,000/-, and if it is divided by twelve, it comes to Rs. 500/- per month. How can we call it an employment guarantee, that too, legal employment? I would like to mention that it is not a new thing for employment generation. We were having many programmes of this nature earlier, and even now, like EAS, NREP, RLEGP, JRY, SGSY, SGRY etc. It is like old wine in a new bottle. The Government wants to encash the old programmes with a new lable. I would like to know from the hon. Minister about the role of Gram Panchayats and Zilla Parishads. There are a lot of ambiguities, like who will select the work, who will implement, when will the wages be paid, whether you have sufficient men at the village level to measure the work, what are the steps taken for ensuring transparency, accessibility and accountability, what are the steps contemplated for giving due publicity to this programme? I recall the statement of Shri Rajiv Gandhi in which it was said that out of the allocation of one rupee, only 10 paisa reaches the targeted person. The Government's slogan of *aam admi* will end up with Middle Men.

Sir, I was the Chairperson of the Zilla Parishad, and I am aware of the difficulties in the implementation of such programmes. Hence I suggest that all the public representatives, from village level to district, should be involved, right from identification of work, beneficiary selection, implementation, payment and maintenance of accounts etc., with total transparency. Sir, now, we are implementing the National Food-for-Work Programme which was implemented by the NDA regime. In Andhra Pradesh, we have implemented this scheme all over the State. Thanks to the former Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Shri Chandra Babu Naidu, for his untiring efforts. He has brought 55 quintals of rice to the State. The

present programme is likely to be implemented in only 8 districts of my State. Sir, this is nothing but pruning the programme, and for this also, this Government wants to take the credit. I want to know whether the National Food-for-Work Programme will also continue in the rest of the districts.

Sir, the hon. Member, Dr. Bimal Jalan, has suggested to establish a separate Ministry and a separate monitoring mechanism for this programme. I fully support the views expressed by him. Sir, I demand that this programme should be implemented throughout the country, with immediate effect. For this purpose, we have also moved an amendment to the Bill. Sir, if this Government still has eyes to see and ears to hear the poor, it must be bold enough to implement much larger employment programme. With these worlds, I support this Bill partially because it will provide employment guarantee to the households for one-third days in a year and for one-third districts in the country. *(Interruptions)*

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY: Why partially?

SHRIMATI VANGA GEETHA: Because this Bill will provide employment guarantee to the households for one-third days in a year and will cover only one-third districts in the country. That is why I partially support this Bill. If the Minister implements this Bill all over the country, I will support it fully. Thank you.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Bill that is being discussed by this august House is truly in the nature of a landmark legislation. It represents a new beginning, a landmark in the regime of rights enjoyed by our people, a landmark in our efforts for social equity and justice through the provision of social safety nets. Sir, it is a path-breaking legislation that entitles our rural poor to a guaranteed employment for a defined number of days, a means of sustenance, a means to avert distress, a means to secure two square meals a day and a means to lift them out of the trap of poverty. It is a commitment that the Congress Party has made to the people of this country in its election manifesto which is the culmination of several decades of efforts of the Congress, under the Prime Ministership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi, to move towards the right to livelihood. It is a commitment of the UPA Government to the nation and this Legislation demonstration over commitment to the cause of the

poor. Sir, the Government acknowledges the pioneering role of the National Advisory Council and Shrimati Sonia Gandhi in drafting this Legislation, in maintaining the momentum and pressure required to bring it to Parliament speedily and in creating the necessary space for public debate which has enabled, in my view, the drafting of a Bill which is comprehensive, wide-ranging and most satisfactory few pieces of legislations have benefited from a debate, as extensive as this one, which has taken place all over our country. History will remember Soniaji for this landmark Legislation, and if this Government is to be remembered for a single law or policy, it will be this one.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, why do we need a legislation of this type? It was the dream of the founding fathers of our Republic that as India industrialises, more and more people will shift out of agriculture and, therefore, industrialisation, by and large, should provide a solution to the problem of securing gainful livelihood for all our people. We have significant achievements in industrialisation. We have today industries in almost every sector of our economy. But it is also true that the pace of industrialisation and the pace of industrial employment associated with that industrialisation has not been as fast as it ought to be. The result is that at the time of Independence, nearly 70 per cent of our people were living in rural areas. Today, the proportion is no less than 60 to 62 per cent. Therefore, employment strategies have to be two-fold. We have to accelerate the tempo of industrialisation. We have to accelerate the tempo of labour-friendly industrialisation. Therefore, what ever comes in the way of speedy industrialisation of our country, in the promotion of labour-intensive methods of production and labour-intensive industries can hurt this process of creating more job opportunities outside agriculture.

This has to be the major plank of our Government in the years to come and I do hope that the process that we have set in motion in the last 15 years will ensure faster and speedier industrialisation of our country. We have still to take measures to see that this industrialisation is as labour-friendly as possible. I will come back to that aspect of the problem a little later. At the same time, for the people who are living in rural areas, we have to create an environment in which their output and employment opportunities can go up. I look at the differences between urban India and the rural India at the time of independence. They were much narrower than what they are today. So, obviously, our rural areas have lagged

behind. The development of our agriculture, investment in agriculture, investment in new agricultural technologies and ensuring that the small and marginal farmers also participate in the processes of the Green Revolution have to be an important plank of our strategy for lifting our population out of poverty. But we know that about 25 per cent of our population are landless. Now, agriculture does offer gainful employment opportunities for a major part of the year even for this population. But we all know that once the seasonal peak, the sowing and harvesting period, is gone, there is considerable unemployment and underemployment in rural areas. We have legislated the minimum wage legislation in our country to take care of the landless labour, to put a floor on their incomes. But we all know that in rural setting of the type that prevails in our country it is very difficult, in practice, to reinforce the minimum wage legislation. So, we need strategies to lift the floor of the poorest of the poor and employment guarantee is one way to increase the bargaining power of the poorest sections of our population, the landless, the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and our women. Now, it is certainly true that what we are offering to our people is a modest amount, gainful employment of 100 days at a minimum wage of Rs. 60 not more than Rs. 500 per month for a family. I recognise that this, by itself, is not sufficient. But taking into account that most agricultural labour households also get some gainful employment during the peak season, the sowing and harvesting period, I do believe that this at the margin, will help, in particular, landless families to raise their living standards. It will help to provide social safety nets which will protect them against the vagaries of unemployment. I sincerely hope that over a period of four or five years we will cover all the rural districts of our country. That is our solemn commitment. Employment schemes have existed for a long number of years. When Indiraji was the Prime Minister, a number of employment programmes were devised. Rajivji devised many agricultural employment programmes. Similar employment assurance schemes were devised when Shri Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister and I was the Finance Minister. There is, however, a cardinal difference. For the first time, we are now recognising the right to work as a fundamental legal right. Therefore, it casts on all of us in Government and all those who are concerned with the processes of governance in this country to make every effort that this solemn commitment, this solemn legal obligation is honoured in letter and spirit.

5.00 P.M.

I will not be one of those who will say that there is no problem in sight. There are problems but life would not be worth living and not that interesting if there were no problems or difficult problems at that. There is first of all, the problem of resources. If the economy continues to grow at the rate of 7 to 8 per cent per annum, I am confident that this country will generate enough resources to finance not only this scheme but also many other schemes which our Government has started. I would like to mention that the major scheme, a major programme for expansion of rural infrastructure, under Bharat Nirman involves a total expenditure of Rs. 1,74,000 crores, for the next four years. We have taken a commitment to expand the network of rural roads; to expand the network of electricity to every village in our country; to provide safe drinking water to all the remaining 74,000 households; to expand irrigation facilities by one crore hectares; to build sixty lakh new rural houses and to ensure that there is, at least, one telephone in every village of our country. In addition to rural infrastructure, we have undertaken a massive expansion of the elementary education programmes. For that, our Government has imposed on education cess which is being earmarked, apart from other budgetary resources, for expansion of the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan. We have, today, in our country, as a result of our efforts last year, a universal Mid-Day-Meal Scheme working all over the country. We have, launched an innovative Rural Health Mission which will take an integrated, holistic, district-wise approach to the problems of rural healthcare and deal with healthcare problems of our rural population in a holistic manner. We are in the process of drawing up an ambitious urban renewal programmes which attends to the needs of our urban areas where today 30 per cent of India's population lives and where we are seeing, as a result, of the disaster that befell Mumbai, how the neglect of infrastructure can have such devastating consequences. We are committed to do all that. We will find resources. But I would like this House to know that these resources can become a reality only if our economy continues to grow at a rate of 7 to 8 per cent. Therefore, all those who have something to do with the processes of governance, have an obligation to ensure that nothing is done which hurts the growth of our economy at a rate of 7 to 8 per cent per annum. Let me say, in the long run, the vision of Pt. Nehru that India has to industrialise to get rid of chronic poverty, ignorance and disease of its people is still valid. We have to industrialise; we have to industrialise at a much faster pace. We have to ensure that this industrialisation is

much more labour-friendly, much more employment-friendly than it has been the case thus far. Therefore, it requires, the creation of an environment in which industries can grow, in which both the public and the private sectors can grow, an environment in which our industry will have the assurance that the Government is a facilitator, that the Government is not handicapped in thinking big about the future of our country. I recollect participating in a discussion in Hyderabad the other day. There are elements of Marxist thought which, I think, very few people who are students of economics and social history can disagree.

All economies, if they have to solve the problems of mass depredation, have to be growing economies. The process of accumulation of capital is the heart of the process of development. Together with the process of capital accumulation and rapid increase in investment, we need to take full advantage of all advances in modern technology. Technology today is creating new production frontiers. And, if India is to grow at the rate of seven to eight per cent, then, not only must we invest in our country at 28-30 per cent of our GDP, but we must also ensure that our enterprises, both in the public and the private sectors, do operate at the frontiers of technology. Therefore, I submit to this august House that if we want the economy to grow at the rate at which it must grow, if we have to honour our solemn commitments to our electorate and to our people of rural regeneration, then, it is also obligatory on all of us to ensure that we set in motion process which accelerates the tempo of industrial growth the employment-friendly growth, that we create an environment where private and public, capital is welcome. I do say to this House, and I am convinced, that India needs significant doses of foreign direct investment to realise the growth rate of seven to eight per cent — and foreign investment will come in. Today, the world looks to India. There is a large amount of capital which is willing to come to India provided we have the vision, provided we have the capability to absorb this capital. I am very happy that my esteemed friend, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, is on a trip to Singapore and Indonesia, and I compliment him for the vision that he has brought there on his duties as Chief Minister of that State. I sincerely hope that all Chief Ministers in our country will emulate the glorious example of Shri Buddhadeb Bhattacharjee.

Also, Sir, if we have to implement these various programmes of rural regeneration, education, healthcare and social assistance, then, the public

finances of our Governments, both at the Centre and in the States have also to be in proper shape. Let me say that there can be a difference of opinion about the size of the fiscal deficit. But no country in the world that I know of has got rich merely by spending its way to prosperity. Good expenditure has a role. I think good expenditure can relieve social distress. Good expenditure can also stimulate investment activity. But there are limits to all good things. Let me say that today the combined fiscal deficit of the Central Government and the State Governments at 10 per cent of our GDP is among the highest in the world. Therefore, it is very essential that this august House and all those who are concerned with the processes of governance would pool all their experience and wisdom to ensure that the fiscal health of our economy, both at the Centre and in the States, is not jeopardised. Therefore, if we have to find resources for programmes like the Employment Guarantee, then, we must look at other items of expenditure. The Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, talked of matching outlays and outcomes. I think that this is something which we should do much more frequently than we have done in the past. It is also necessary for us to recognise that the types of practices which have grown in our country are not conducive to good governance or to promoting the growth of our economy or even to promoting the cause of social justice.

Then as I look at India's electricity industry, India's electricity industry today loses Rs. 30,000 crores.

I think, all observers of the Indian rural scene are agreed that the way we price our electricity is the cause of the bankruptcy of most of our State Electricity Boards. They have no money to expand the electricity system. Therefore, people who are waiting for electricity are being discriminated against. And, yet, this culture of subsidisation, subsidisation of even those who do not deserve has come to have a hold which, I think, is pernicious for the growth of our economy, or, for the maintenance of an orderly fiscal health of our economy.

In the same way, I would say, what is happening today in the petroleum sector — and I am not making a partisan speech — is that, for the first time in our history today, some of our *navaratnas,*— and my heart, bleeds when I see them; these are the jewels which our nation, our workers, our farmers have toiled with their blood and sweat to build up — are making cash losses. I think that is something which is a negation of good

governance. We must, therefore, find ways to see that the public sector enterprises are run efficiently, that the role of the public sector as a major entity in the growth process should not be undermined.

When Panditji talked about public sector, he had two things in mind. Looking at the history of the capitalist system, he came to the conclusion that capital accumulation was at the heart of the process. Therefore, by nationalising profits, by preventing wasteful consumption of the rich and the super rich class, you accelerate the tempo of development of the economy. But if you run a public sector like post office socialism, if there are losses, and if you frown on public sector making adequate profits, then you are negating that vision that vision which led Panditji to emphasise the dynamic role of the public sector in our national economy.

Secondly, if you socialise profits — and profits in a capitalist economy are the single most important source of accumulation, also of income distribution — you kill two birds with one stone; you accelerate the tempo of accumulation; you also reduce inequalities in income and wealth. But this reduction in income and wealth disparties can take place only if the public sector makes profits. If the public sector is increasingly used to subsidise many of the consumers who are not so poor, then, I think, we are operating in a manner in which, I think, the public sector cannot play its historic role.

Therefore, Sir, I submit to this august House that while we enact this very historic legislation, we must not forget that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. In the same way, if this legislation is to yield the desired results, it is necessary that all of us work to ensure that our economy in the next ten years does grow at the rate of seven to eight per cent, that we create a climate for enterprise where both private and public sector investment, including foreign direct investment, can find a hospitable place. I think, China today gets fifty to sixty billion dollars of foreign direct investment. We get not more than five to six billion dollars. I know for certain that there are people who want to come and invest in our country. But they complain about our bureaucracy; they complain about our corruption; they complain about the uncertainty of our labour laws. I am not saying they are right or they are wrong. But I think, we, as a nation, have a collective responsibility to set our house in order.

And I say so because India is the flavour of the year. This thing cannot last for ever. Let us take advantage of this highnoon tide, this tide which

is running in our favour. In the next five or six years, we must use all resources that we can really mobilise, to build top-class infrastructure. When I go to South-East Asia, I look at Thailand; I look at Malaysia; I look at Singapore — what type of infrastructure do they have! They were nowhere in the scene when India became independent. Today, in terms of their infrastructure, the quality of their infrastructure, I think, they are way ahead of us. So, I think, we have a limited time to catch up, and this august House, therefore, has a responsibility in this regard. In the same way, if we have to implement successfully the social safety nets of the type which we are putting in place today, then, it is very essential that the fiscal health of the economy must not be under-mined, that all of us must ensure that our public sector enterprises, do, in fact, carry out the mandate, the vision, that characterised the vision of Jawaharlal Nehru. And, I am sure, Sir, if we do that, we will be able to implement not only this programme but many more ambitious programmes of social justice, expanding the network of social safety nets, of ensuring that our children, that our women, that our older citizens do get effective social safety nets to protect them. Therefore, Sir, in requesting this House to endorse this legislation, I thought I would draw the attention of this House to the imperatives which we have to tackle, if processes of governance have to be harnessed to build a new India free from the fear of war, want and exploitation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. Now, Prof. R.B.S. Varma.

प्रो॰ रामबख्श सिंह वर्मा: माननीय सभापति महोदय, सबसे पहले मैं आपका और अपनी पार्टी के प्रति आभार व्यक्त करना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने मुझे इस अत्यंत महत्वपूर्ण विधेयक पर बोलने का अवसर प्रदान किया है।

मान्यवर, जिस समय मैं बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं, मैं समझता हूं कि यह मेरे लिए अति महत्वपूर्ण है और यह गौरव का अवसर है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के इस महत्वपूर्ण भाषण के बाद में, मुझे यह अवसर प्राप्त हो रहा है।

माननीय सभापति जी, मेरे लिए यह गौरव का विषय रहा है, यह सुअवसर रहा है कि प्रस्तुत विधेयक पर संसद की स्थायी समिति में, व्यापक रूप में समिति के अन्य सदस्यों के साथ विचार-विनिमय कर सका और मैं अपने विचारों को प्रस्तुत कर सका।

माननीय सभापति जी, प्रस्तुत विधेयक दूसरे सदन से पारित होकर के इस रूप में, इस सदन में आया है। उसके तथाकथित क्रांतिकारी स्वरूप से भविष्य में ग्रामीणों की आर्थिक स्थिति में संभावित क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन का श्रेय अभी से सत्तारूढ़ पार्टियां अथवा उनकी सहयोगी पार्टियां लेना चाहती हैं। यह स्वाभाविक भी है और मैं इससे ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: कृपया शांति रखिये।

प्रो॰ रामबक्ष सिंह वर्मा: मैं इससे पूर्णत: असहमत नहीं हूं, परन्तु मैं पूर्णत: सहमत भी नहीं हूं। मान्यवर, इसके दो कारण हैं। पहला कारण तो यह है कि इस विधेयक को सभी दलों का समर्थन प्राप्त है। लोक सभा में विस्तृत बहस के उपरांत इस विधेयक को सर्वसम्मति से पारित किया गया है। मान्यवर, इसका दूसरा कारण यह है कि इस विधेयक पर उस ग्रामीण विकास संसदीय स्थायी समिति में परीक्षण करके और सर्वसम्मति से निर्णय लेकर अनुशंसा की गई है, जिस समिति के सभापति लोक सभा में भारतीय जनता पार्टी के माननीय सदस्य तथा उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्व मुख्य मंत्री श्री कल्याण सिंह जी हैं। इस अवसर पर मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं कि संसदीय स्थायी समिति ने जिस रूप में अनुशंसा की है, यह सरकार उन सारी अनुशंसाओं को मानने में असफल रही है। अगर उन सारी अनुशंसाओं को माना जाता, तो वास्तव में गरीबी उन्मूलन की दिशा में यह क्रांतिकारी कदम अवश्य होता।

मान्यवर, यह कहना ज्यादा उचित होगा कि इस विधेयक के पक्ष में सर्वसम्मति है, अत: इसको पारित होने का श्रेय इस सदन तथा दूसरे सदन के सभी माननीय सदस्यों को अथवा प्रकारान्तर से कहा जा सकता है कि सभी राजनैतिक दलों को भी मिलना चाहिए। हां, मैं मानता हूं कि इसका श्रेय सत्तारूढ़ दल और उसकी सहयोगी पार्टियों तथा समर्थक दलों को थोड़ा ज्यादा मिलना चाहिए क्योंकि यह विधेयक उनके द्वारा संसद में लाया गया है, परन्तु यहां मैं यह अवश्य जोड़ना चाहूंगा कि जो मैं उनको इस बात का दरियादिली के साथ क्रेडिट दे रहा हूं वही दरियादिली – कांग्रेस और उनके सहयोगी तथा जो अन्य समर्थक दल हैं – तब नहीं दिखा पाए जब पोखरन –1998 – अथवा कारगिल अभियान के दौरान यह दरियादिली प्रदर्शित करने का अवसर उनके सामने आया था। मान्यवर, मैं केवल वर्तमान विधेयक के बारे में ही स्वयं को सीमित रखना चाहूंगा क्योंकि मुझे मालूम है कि मेरा समय सीमित है। सभापति महोदय, ग्रामीण विकास मंत्री जी ने विधेयक में प्रस्तुतिकरण के समय, देशवासियों, विशेषकर ग्रामीणों को ऐसी आशा बंधाई है कि अगले पंद्रह वर्षों में अर्थात 2020 तक इस देश से गरीबी का उन्मूलन हो जाएगा, वह समाप्त हो जाएगी। मान्यवर, उन्होंने एक कविता भी पढ़ी है:

दूध हो दूध हो, तुम्हारा दूध खोजने हम जाते हैं।
हटो व्योम से मेघपंथ, स्वर्ग लूटने हम आते हैं।

ऐसा लगता है, कहीं स्वर्ग का खजाना लूटकर, कुबेर का खजाना लूट करके माननीय मंत्री जी इस देश के ग्रामीण इलाकों में उस खजाने को लुटा देना चाहते हैं। लेकिन मान्यवर, यह कविता पढ़ने और सुनने में अच्छी हो सकती है, इससे लोगों में आशा भी उत्पन्न हो सकती है, लेकिन वास्तविकता क्या है, उसका एक चित्र मैं आपके सामने खींचना चाहता हूं। मान्यवर, जब यह विधेयक अधिनियम में परिवर्तित हो जाएगा, उस समय माननीय मंत्री जी, जो आंकड़े कहते हैं, वह मैं आपके सम्मुख रखना चाहता हूं। इस देश की 72 करोड़ ग्रामीण आबादी है और इस विधेयक के माध्यम से आप केवल 6 करोड़ लोगों को सौ दिन का रोजगार दे पाएंगे। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि एक household — जो आपने परिवार की परिभाषा दी है, हाउसहोल्ड — में करीब-करीब 12 लोगों की संख्या है। उस हाउसहोल्ड को आप एक वर्ष में 6 हजार रुपए का अर्जन, इतनी मात्र पूंजी उस परिवार को दे पाएंगे। अर्थात् कहा जा सकता है कि एक व्यक्ति को एक साल में केवल 500 रुपए मिलेंगे अर्थात् एक व्यक्ति को एक महीने में केवल 42 रुपए का अर्जन होगा अर्थात एक व्यक्ति को एक दिन में केवलमात्र 1 रुपया 40 पैसे का अर्जन होगा और आप कह रहे हैं कि हम गरीबी का उन्मूलन कर देंगे? केवल एक रुपया 40 पैसे का इजाफा होने से ईस देश की गरीबी दूर नहीं होगी। आप सपना चाहे कैसा देख लें, मुझे लगता है कि आप भ्रम की स्थिति में हैं। यह दिवास्वप्न है और अच्छा होगा कि यह दिवास्वप्न, यह भ्रम की स्थिति जल्दी ही सरकार में काम करने वाले लोगों और इस देश को संचालित करने वाले लोगों के मन से दूर हो जाए—उससे देश का बड़ा कल्याण होगा। हां, मैं एक बात कह सकता हूं कि अगर यह योजना ईमानदारी से लागू हो गयी तो इस देश में जो भूख से मौतें हो रही थी।, उस कलंक से एक सीमा तक हम बच सकेंगे। मान्यवर, फिर भी इस विधेयक का महत्व कम नहीं है। यह सही है कि यह विधेयक अपने आप में ऐतिहासिक भी है और यह विधेयक क्रांतिकारी भी है। ऐतिहासिक इसलिए है कि कि संसद के इतिहास में पहली बार, आजादी के 58 वर्षों के बाद में भारत के सभी जरूरतमंद नागरिकों के लिए तो नहीं, कम से कम ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के रहने वाले नागरिकों के लिए ही सही, पूरे वर्ष के लिए न सही, 100 दिनों के लिए ही सही, किसी गृहस्थी अर्थात् household के सभी वयस्क सदस्यों के लिए न सही, कम से कम एक वयस्क सदस्य के लिए ही सही, काम देने की गारंटी की गयी है और काम न दे पाने की स्थिति में उस household को बेरोजगारी का भत्ता देने की बाध्यता — यह जिम्मेदारी कानूनन शासन ने ली है और इसलिए मैं कह सकता हूं कि यह विधेयक ऐतिहासिक है क्योंकि इससे पहले इतना भी नहीं किया गया था। मान्यवर, इस देश में गरीबी हटाओ का नारा देकर राजनैतिक दल सत्ता में तो आते रहे हैं।

उसके लिए मैं किसी राजनीतिक दल का यहां उल्लेख नहीं करना चाहता परंतु आजादी के 58 वर्षों के बाद भी गरीबी कम नहीं हुई है, असमानता घटी नहीं है। इस विधेयक के पारित हो जाने पर और अधिनियम के कार्यान्वयन के उपरान्त गरीबी कम करने की दिशा में, लोगों को भूखे

मरने से बचाने की दिशा में प्रस्तुत एक क्रांतिकारी कदम, यह विधेयक सिद्ध हो सकता है। इसलिए मैंने इसे ऐतिहासिक और क्रांतिकारी विधेयक की संज्ञा दी है, बशर्ते इस योजना को ईमानदारी से लागू किया जाए। परंतु मुझे शक है और शक इसलिए है क्योंकि दूध का जला व्यक्ति छाछ को भी फूंक-फूंक कर पीता है। मान्यवर, हमारे देश का जो संसदीय इतिहास रहा है, जो तमाम कल्याणकारी योजनाएं बनाई गई हैं, लाखों-करोड़ रूपए स्वीकृत हुए हैं और खर्च भी किए गए हैं, परंतु गरीबी घटी नहीं है, असमानता घटी नहीं है, हां, कार्यान्वयन में लगे हुए अधिकारी ज़रूर मालामाल हुए हैं। माननीय मंत्री जी, मैं आपको कुछ सुझाव देना चाहता हूं। एक सुझाव तो मैं यह देना चाहता हूं कि आप ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के लिए यह विधेयक लाए हैं, स्वागत है, लेकिन आपका कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम यह नहीं कहता है। आप तो इस देश से गरीबी हटाना चाहते हैं और आपने कहा कि अगर आवश्यक होगा तो शहरी क्षेत्र के लिए भी विधेयक लाएंगे। तो देर क्या है। अगर इस सत्र में नहीं, तो फिर वादा कीजिए, हम लोगों को आश्वासन दीजिए कि आने वाले winter session में शहरी क्षेत्र की गरीबी के उन्मूलन के लिए आप इसी प्रकार का एक विध ेयक लाएंगे। विधेयक में एक अच्छा कदम यह उठाया गया है कि इसके सेंटर में आपने पंचायतों को रखा है, पंचायती राज इंस्टीट्युशन्स को रखा है, यह अच्छा कदम है लेकिन माननीय मंत्री जी, आपको मालूम है कि अभी तक इन पंचायतों को फंड्ज़, फंक्शन और फंक्शनरीज़— इनका डिवॉल्यूशन नहीं हूआ है, इनका अंतरण नहीं हुआ हे और जब तक यह अंतरण नहीं होता है, इस विधेयक की सफलता में शक बना रहेगा, मैं समझता हूं कि आप भी इसे मानेंगे।

महोदय, मेरा तीसरा सुझाव यह है कि अगर यह योजना लागू होती है तो भूख से मरने की नौबत तो नहीं आएगी, लेकिन गरीबी समाप्त नहीं होगी। ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के प्रत्येक वयस्क नागरिक को, अभी आपने एक हाउसहोल्ड में एक वयस्क को सौ दिन का रोज़गार देने की गारंटी की है। धीरे-धीरे आप कदम आगे बढ़ाइए, आगे जब इसमें संशोधन लाएं, तो मेरी मांग है कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में रहने वाले हर व्यक्ति को, जिसकी मांग है, जो नीडी है, उसको आप काम देने की व्यवस्था करें।

महोदय, मेरा अगला सुझाव है कि राज्यों की आर्थिक देनदारी आपने दस प्रतिशत निश्चित की है। राज्यों की जो आर्थिक दशा है, वह आपसे छिपी नहीं हैं आप तो सेंटर में बैठते हैं, सारे राज्यों की आर्थिक स्थिति क्या है, आपको पता है। आपसे मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस दस प्रतिशत की देनदारी से उन्हें मुक्त करें और उनके ऊपर देनदारी केवल अनइम्पलायमेंट अलाउंस की ही रखें, बाकी देनदारियों से उन्हें मुक्त रखें।

मान्यवर, जिस समय इस विधेयक पर स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में विचार हो रहा था—श्रीमती कारत यहां पर बैठी हुई है—उस समय उन्होंने महिलाओं के पक्ष में कुछ बातें रखी थीं, वे सब बातें मान ली गई

हैं। उनकी बातें सही थीं। वामदलों का दबाव भी हो सकता है, हम भी उससे सहमत हैं, लेकिन विकलांगों के बारे में जो सुझाव दिए गए थे, उनको इस विधेयक में आपने इनकारपोरेट नहीं किया है। आपसे मेरा अनुरोध है कि विकलांगों को भी जस्टिस देने का काम आप करें। जब भी आप आगे इस विधेयक में संशोधन लाएं, तो विकलांगो के लिए भी इस पर विचार करें।

मान्यवर, मेरा एक अन्य सुझाव है कि पैनल्टी देने का जो प्रावधान आपने किया है, जो अधिकारी और कर्मचारी गलत काम करेंगे, आजकल एक हजार रूपए की पैनल्टी कुछ नहीं है। मान्यवर, इसे बढ़ाइए वरना बहुत भ्रष्टाचार होगा। इस पर आप नियंत्रण नहीं कर पाएंगे और संसदीय समिति ने जो सामूहिक रूप से संस्तुति की थी, अनुशंसा की थी कि कम से कम पच्चीस हज़ार का जुर्माना होना चाहिए, आपने घटाकर एक हज़ार कर दिया--तो इस तरह से भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ेगा, कम नहीं होगा।

मान्यवर, इसके बाद मैं इस बिल के जो प्रावधान हैं, उनके बारे में कुछ बातें रखना चाहूंगा। पेज नंबर 2 में बार-बार ''परिवार'' कहते हैं, यह परिवार नहीं, यह ''हाउसहोल्ड'', 'गृहस्थी है' और ''गृहस्थी'' की आपने जो परिभाषा दी है, वह ठीक नहीं है। इससे डिस्क्रिमिनेशन होगा, मनमाने तरीके से लोग उसकी परिभाषा करेंगे, इसलिए इस ''हाउसहोल्ड'' की एक डेफिनेट परिभाषा होनी चाहिए, यह अनुरोध आपसे है।

इसी तरह पेज नंबर 3 पर क्लॉज नं 6, क्लॉज नं 6(1) एण्ड (2), आपने एक तरफ कहा है कि साठ रुपए मिनिमम दिया जाएगा, दूसरी तरफ कहा है कि उस प्रदेश में घोषित मिनिमम मजदूरी के बराबर दिया जाएगा। यह कंफ्लिटिग है, कंफ्यूजिंग है, आपको इसे स्पष्ट करना चाहिए। इसके बाद पेज नंबर 4 पर अनएम्प्लोएमेंट एलाउंस के बारे में है। अनएम्प्लाएमेंट अलाउंस के बारे में संसदीय समिति ने अनुशंसा की थी।

श्री सभापति: माननीय सदस्य कन्क्लुड कीजिए।

प्रो॰ रामबख्श सिंह वर्मा: सभापति जी, मैं दो मिनट में कन्क्लूड करता हूं। यह अनुशंसा थी कि पहले एक महीने तक जो मिनिमम वेज है, उसका आधा और उसके बाद तीन चौथाई, वह आपने उसे घटा दिया है, अनुशंसा नहीं मानी है। मैं समझता हूं कि इससे भी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर दबाव कम होगा, अगर आप इसे मानेंगे तो अच्छा होगा। इसी प्रकार से इसी पेज नंबर 4 पर अनुच्छेद 8 (3) में आपने स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के द्वारा अनएम्प्लोएमेंट अलाउंस देने की जो बात कही है, उसमें कहा है कि (a) expeditiously, as possible. It is there. It is not well-defined. इसलिए कुछ टाइम लिमिट फिक्स कीजिए कि पंद्रह दिन में, सात दिन में या तीस दिन में जो अनएम्प्लोएमेंट अलाउंस है वह अवश्य दे दिया जाएगा। इसके बाद पेज नंबर 5 पर अनुच्छेद नंबर

10 (3) में ''सी'' और ''ई'' हैं, ये दोनो समानार्थक हैं, इन दोनों को अलग-अलग रखने का क्या कारण है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया है। पेज नंबर 9 पर अनुच्छेद 22 में, 22 (2) ए, बी, सी, यह जो फंडिंग का पैटर्न है, उस संबंध में, जैसाकि मैंने आपसे पहले कहा है कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर कम से कम बर्डन होना चाहिए, पेज नं 27 पर क्रियान्वयन में खामी होने पर, कमी होने पर केंद्र सरकार फंडिंग रोक सकती है। मान्यवर, इससे तो गरीब का नुकसान होगा, आप फंडिंग क्यों रोक देंगे? आप पेसे को क्यों रिलीज नहीं करेंगे? इसमें जो कर्मचारी और अधिकारी दोषी है, उसे अवश्य दंडित करें, लेकिन फंडिंग या पैसे को रिलीज करने से न रोकें। इसी तरह से आपने कहा है कि शेड्यूल को अमेंड करने की पावर सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के पास रहेगी। आप जब चाहेंगे मनमाने तरीके से शेड्यूल को बदल देंगे, इसलिए हमारी मांग है कि This should be part of the bill itself. अगर आप कभी संशोधन लाते हैं, तो यह संशोधन पार्लियामेंट के द्वारा अप्रूव होना चाहिए, तब तक कोई संशोधन नहीं होना चाहिए, यह आपसे मांग है। जो मैं आपसे अंतिम बात कहना चाहता हूं, पेज नं 14 पर प्वाइंट नंबर 5 में अपने कहा है कि मैक्सिमम सौ दिन की मजदूरी, जब कि आपका जो लॉज डेफिनेशन है, उसमें आपने कहा है मिनिमम हंड्रेड डेज। एक तरफ मैक्सिमम हंड्रड डेज और एक तरफ मिनिमम हंड्रेड डेज, इन दोनों में विरोधाभास है। आप कृपया इसे दुरुस्त करने की कृपा करें। अंत में माननीय मंत्री जी मैं यही कहना चाहता हूं, आपने बहुत कविताएं पढ़ी हैं, मैं एक कविता आपको उद्धृत करते हुए अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा कि:

हे ग्राम देवता नमस्कार
सोने, चांदी से नहीं,
किंतु तुमने मिट्टी से किया प्यार।

इस तरह की कविताएं हैं। जो आपने कविताएं पढ़ी हैं, उनसे ग्रामीण लोगों को भ्रमित तो किया जा सकता है, अब मिट्टी से प्यार करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, आर्थिक सशक्तिकरण की भी आवश्यकता है। माननीय मंत्री जी, मुझे मालूम है कि आप गांव के रहने वाले हैं, आप ग्रास रूट वर्कर रहे हैं, आप लोगों का दर्द पहचानते हैं, लेकिन आपकी तरफ बैठे लोगों ने श्रीमती सोनिया गांधी की तो हजार बार प्रशंसा की है, वे प्रशंसा के योग्य भी हो सकती हैं मैं यह नहीं कहता हूं कि गलत प्रशंसा की है, लेकिन आपसे पहले वक्ताओं ने माननीय मंत्री जी आपका एक बार भी नाम नहीं लिया है। इस कमी को मैं पूरा कर रहा हूं, मैं आपकी प्रशंसा कर रहा हूं कि आप यह एक बहुत अच्छा बिल लाए हैं। निश्चित रूप से गरीबी उन्मूलन की दिशा में यह एक क्रांतिकारी कदम है...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रूद्रनारायण पाणि: प्रधान मंत्री का नाम नहीं लिया है...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठ जाइए, इनकी कविता क्यों खराब कर रहे हैं।

प्रो॰ रामबख्श सिंह वर्मा: माननीय मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि इसे इम्प्लिमेंट करने के लिए तमाम एजेंसियां, सेंट्रल कौंसिल, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट, स्टेट कौंसिल, उसके बाद जिला पंचायत, जिला कॉर्डिनेटिंग ऑफिसर, उसके बाद ब्लॉक पंचायत, अर्थात इंटरमीडिएट पंचायत, उसके बाद ब्लॉक ऑफिसर प्रोग्राम उसके बाद ग्राम पंचायत और ग्राम सभा।

एक बड़ी श्रृंखला है अगर इस श्रृंखला की एक भी कड़ी कमज़ोर रह गई, तो आपका सपना बिखर जाएगा, इसलिए चौकन्ना रहने की आवश्यकता है। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का पुरजोर समर्थन करता हूं। सभापति जी, आपने मुझे इस बिल पर बोलने का अवसर दिया, इसके लिए धन्यवाद। मैंने एक-दो मिनट ज्यादा समय ले लिया है, लेकिन आपने टोका नहीं, आपकी इस कृपा के लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूं। धन्यवाद।

Recommendation of the Business Advisory Committee

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the House that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 24th August, 2005, has allocated time for the Government legislative and other business as follows:

Sl. No.	Business	Time allotted
01	Consideration and passing of the following Bills after they have been passed by Lok Sabha: The Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) and Financial Institutions Law (Amendment) Bill, 2005.	2 Hours
	The National Tax Tribunal Bill, 2005.	3 Hours

The Committee also recommended that in order to complete Government Legislative Business, the current Session of Rajya Sabha be extended up to the 30th August, 2005. The House would accordingly sit on Monday, the 29th August, and Tuesday, the 30th August, 2005, and that there will be no Question Hour on these days.